



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

D

DANVILLE
QUARTERLY REVIEW,
FOR THE YEAR 1881

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY LIBRARY ✓

MOORE, W. L. G. & CO. PRINTERS

THE
DANVILLE
QUARTERLY REVIEW,
FOR THE YEAR 1863.

EDITED BY
AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS:


ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, D. D., LL. D.,	} Professors in Danville Theological Seminary.
EDWARD P. HUMPHREY, D. D.,	
STEPHEN YERKES, D. D.,	
ROBERT L. STANTON, D. D.,	
JAMES MATTHEWS,	} Professors in Centre College, Danville.
JACOB COOPER, Ph. D.,	
ROBERT W. LANDIS, D. D., Chaplain U. S. Army.	

Φωτίσαντος δὲ ζῶν καὶ ἄφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.—2 Tim. i: 10.

VOL. III.

DANVILLE, KY., AND CINCINNATI:

PUBLISHED BY
MOORE, WILSTACH, KEYS & CO.,
25 WEST FOURTH STREET.
1863.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

No. I.

	PAGE.
ART. I.—Inquiry of Human Society.....	1
II.—Commentary on Ecclesiastes.....	38
III.—Politics and the Church.....	62
IV.—Credibility of the Resurrection of the Dead.....	121
V.—The New Life of the Redeemed. Part I.....	144

No. II.

ART. I.—Studies on the Bible. No. IV. The Exodus; Passover; Priest- hood; Borrowing the Jewels.....	181
II.—The Element of Admonition in the Epistle to the Hebrews.....	205
III.—The Peril and Duty of the American People.....	217
IV.—Chaplaincy in the Army.....	255
V.—“The Puritans and their Principles” Examined.....	288
VI.—The True Mission of the Church.....	311
VII.—“A Manual of Worship suited for Use in Legislative and other bodies,” Examined.....	341

CONTENTS.

No. III.

	PAGE.
ART. I.—The Union and the Constitution. No. I.....	345
II.—The General Assembly of 1863.....	370
III.—Studies on the Bible. No. V. Israel in the Wilderness.....	453
IV.—A Practical Discourse on Christian Beneficence; the Bible Argument.....	483

No. IV.

ART. I.—The Shams and Pretensions of Physical Philosophy.....	523
II.—The Union and the Constitution. No. II.....	539
III.—“The Army Chaplain's Manual” Examined.....	568
IV.—Studies on the Bible. No. VI. The First Gospel.....	593
V.—The New Life of the Redeemed. Part II.....	619
VI.—The Nation and the Insurgents.....	642
VII.—Recent Publications.....	686

DANVILLE REVIEW.

No. I.

MARCH, 1863.

ART. I.—*An Inquiry into the True Doctrine of Human Society, Civil Government, the Magistracy, and the Citizen, as Revealed by God, with Special Reference to the State of Public Affairs in America.*

It is wonderful to note in how many ways, with what subtilty and force, and under what constancy of operation through all ages, the impulses to which our nature is subject, or those which fasten on a particular generation, or even those which distinguish a party, a sect, or a faction, diffuse themselves through the religious life of men, control and direct their moral sentiments and judgments, and determine even the bent of their rational faculties in their perceptions of positive truth divinely revealed in an unalterable form. It would be hard to deny that these impulses are often just and even heroic; to deny that, taken altogether, they constitute a class of powers capable of being used with immense effect in the general advancement of the human race; or to question that God, whose sublime prerogative it is to bring good out of evil itself, has not revealed to us the manner in which they are to be curbed, to be directed, and to be purged. In their very nature he has bounded them by laws which, in a peculiar manner, limit the force, whether for good or evil, of each one of them, and which enable the wise and courageous among the children of men to foresee their course, and to augment, to modify, or in some degree to defeat their effect. It is only at great intervals, and under the most extraordinary circumstances, that any particular one of these mighty impulses is apt to

recur. Under all circumstances they have a surprising tendency to be diverted, each one from its own course, into the course of some kindred one; and, it is common to them all, that not one of them accomplishes completely the object to which it directed the energies of man; and that every one of them is liable—after a period of torpor—to be succeeded by another heterogeneous to itself. In a very high sense, therefore, our servitude to them is voluntary; while, learning our philosophy as well as our religion from God, we admit that it is only when the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, has set us free from the law of sin and death, that we can become the masters, instead of being the slaves, of these principalities and powers, entrenched about our souls, these mighty rulers of the darkness of this world, against which the children of light wrestle well only when they have put on the whole armor of God. Contemning, therefore, whatever sets aside Christ, and his kingdom, and his Gospel, in such questions, and so that latest and shallowest form of pretentious hypocrisy, which would exclude the highest crimes against society from the list of sins against God, upon the absurd pretext that, *as crimes*, their cognizance belongs only to the State; what we propose is, by the light of divine revelation and upon the basis of Christian morality, to disentangle the elements of the true nature of society, and government, and citizenship, and to fortify the minds of men in a clear conviction of the sinfulness of all injustice and oppression by human governments, and of the destructive wickedness of the impulses to treason, rebellion, sedition, and anarchy, on the part of the citizen—both of which seem to be chronic curses of our race. And the observations we have made, while they point out the nature of the peculiar peril hanging over all American society, civil and religious, and the shape which immediate succor to it should take; disclose, in like manner, the duty of good men and the highest encouragement to its performance.

We shall not stop to prove the existence of God, the fundamental point of all such arguments as this, which we suppose no reader of these pages will question. But as soon as this is admitted it follows that we, as his dependent and responsible creatures, are bound, under the very highest sanctions, to regulate all our actions concerning which the idea of *duty* has

any place, by *his will*, so far as we know or can ascertain it. Of necessity, therefore, if human society is possible, and human government as its first and most direct product is possible, allegiance on the part of the citizen, which is his first *duty* to society and government, exists primarily in the domain of *morals*—and is to be discharged primarily, like every other duty, with reference to God. Of necessity, likewise, the rejection of any of these obvious truths obliges us, if we are capable of following a connected chain of thought, to reject all notion of duty and of God, and practically makes human society impossible, or a curse. Neither shall we stop to prove that God has provided a Mediator between himself and fallen men, and that this Mediator is his Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ; for we trust none of our readers will question this glorious truth, which is fundamental and decisive in carrying every question of *duty* one step higher than we have before placed it, by locating it in the domain of *Christian morality*. For as soon as we admit the existence of a Mediator between God and men, who is our only and all sufficient Saviour—then it is *his will*, so far as it is known, or can be ascertained by us, by which, in the view and hope of salvation, we are bound to regulate all our actions concerning which the idea of duty can arise. And having admitted all the truths set forth in the previous statement concerning God, if we now reject those set forth in this statement concerning Christ, we are obliged, if we are capable of connected thought, to separate the idea of salvation from the idea of sin—obliged to dethrone the Saviour and subvert the Christian religion. As in the former case, the attempt to screen our sin from the face of God, leads to atheism—in this latter case the attempt to hide it from the face of Christ, leads to infidelity, and most generally in the vile form of hypocritical licentiousness. When we speak of the will of God as the rule of duty to man considered as his dependent and accountable creature—and of the will of the divine Saviour as the rule of duty to man considered as fallen and guilty; and in both instances speak of that will as known to us, or as capable of being ascertained by us; we have not distinguished at all as to the manner in which that will, which is our rule of duty, is made known to us—nor urged the immense obligation resting on us, as well as our supreme interest,

to ascertain what that will is. This last topic would be pertinent here—chiefly as illustrating the very high position which the duty of allegiance due by the citizens of all states, and especially of a free commonwealth, occupies in the code both of natural and of Christian morality; and of illustrating, further, that treason and all similar offenses against society—are so far from being exempt from moral censure in the name of God and of Christ, *because* the state treats them as enormous crimes, that in effect the state is authorized to treat them in that manner, because their enormous sinfulness is the chief ground and measure of their enormous destructiveness. And the other topic—the manner in which the will that controls our actions is made known to us—need not be discussed here. Because, no matter in what, or how many ways, we come to the *knowledge* of that will—and no matter how readily we admit that it is perfectly obligatory, however ascertained, there is a way of knowing it, invested with divine certainty, and clothed with divine authority—whose existence is known, and whose use is attainable by all who will ever read these lines. The word of God, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the infallible rule of all *duty* of every human being, whether to God, to himself, or to other human beings; and, moreover, it is the infallible rule of knowledge and belief, concerning all truth that underlies all duty required of man. We shall not stop to prove these statements; but only ask any who deny them to consider fairly what we have to say, and then decide whether it is not perfectly conclusive, upon the supposition that the Scriptures are what we have represented them to be; perfectly conclusive as against every one who admits them to be what they declare they are.

If there is anything at all taught with perfect clearness, and with absolute constancy, throughout the Scriptures, it is taught that God is the author of all the intelligence inferior to his own that exists in the universe; that every created will is subordinated to his infinite will; and that all power is an emanation from his almighty power. As it regards man, who is the head of the visible creation of God, his possession, in the form of human faculties, of the image and likeness of these divine attributes which distinguish God as an infinite personal

Spirit—distinguishes him as a finite personal spirit, and enables him, in the exercise of these faculties, in a finite manner, to understand God, to choose God, and to obey God. Two immense events have befallen man, whereby, in his fall, his ability unto these ends was first fearfully weakened, and whereby, in his restoration to God, that ability was afterward purged and restored in Christ. As the common philosophy, both moral and mental, had its origin among nations who had lost the true knowledge of God, and who knew nothing clearly either of the fall or recovery of man; all it could do was to give account of man, not as he was at first, nor as he is when restored, but as he appears in his ordinary and feeblest estate. As explained by God, and not by the disciples of a philosophy essentially heathen and necessarily erroneous, this type of existence, beginning in the divine nature, and reproduced as a shadow by its image and likeness in individual men; reappears as the cause of the very nature, and is made manifest in the vital action, of every association of men into organized society, and under every possible form of what can be called regular government. It is all, and everywhere, the manifestation of a predominant will by which the actions of the members of whatever household, or state, or church, must be regulated; the manifestation of a predominant intelligence, by which that will is interpreted and applied to those actions; the manifestation of a predominant power, by which the determinations of that will and the conclusions of that intelligence, are enforced, and the violations of them punished. Human society, the concrete of men, who are the image of God, can not be organized, nor can the functions by which its existence is manifested be performed—except in this manner—neither more nor less: nor is it at all material to the nature of the case, what form it may put on; law, and the interpretation and application of law, and the enforcement of law—will, intelligence, power; there is nothing more, nothing less. Those divine attributes which are distinctive of God, considered as an infinite personal Spirit; those human faculties which are distinctive of man, considered as a finite personal spirit, capable of understanding, choosing, and obeying God; those functions of society which are distinctive of it, considered as an ordinance of God, competent to exist and act

in an organized manner, under a government, whether domestic, social, civil, or sacred; all, when carefully considered, present that relation of intimate resemblance which the Scriptures disclose—and that relation of creation and dependence of the second, and of ordination of the third, which the Scriptures declare. This seems to us a most remarkable concatenation; a singular and most intimate proof—lying in the nature of God, of man, and of society, that the primary relations of the whole subject we are discussing are essentially moral and religious; a clear and complete explanation why the sacred Scriptures should treat so expressly and in such various ways, of those civil and political duties and relations, which are so often treated by men as if they were merely fortuitous, or depended wholly on human caprice. Remove from the sphere of human affairs, the notion of these divine attributes of which we have spoken, and what rational basis is left for human society or government—what support for them in human nature—what origin of their enormous powers—even unto life and death, and what authority for the exercise of them? On the other hand, what hope is there for personal freedom, if we give up the notion that magistrates are responsible to an infinite power for the exercise of their office; what hope of public security, where no divine will is recognized as paramount in the affairs of states and nations; what hope of the progress of society, where the light of divine intelligence is excluded? And where liberty, security, and progress are theoretically excluded, and practically impossible, we have that horrible consummation of organized wickedness and wretchedness, which it is a mockery to call human society—and impious to treat as the ordinance of God.

It is easy to understand, therefore, how, what was once a true church of God, may, by desperate and persistent apostacy, become a synagogue of Satan; and the sacred Scriptures declare to us, not only the terrible fact, but the manner in which it occurs. It is equally easy to understand, how states, once highly blessed of God, may forfeit his favor and protection, and be utterly destroyed; and, in effect, the wreck of subverted kingdoms lie thickly along the whole course of the past, and the word of God explains with great clearness the causes of all this ruin—and the particular circumstances of a

very large part of it. And the sum of all is the most thorough and absolute confutation of every notion, every principle, every allegation that tends to the exclusion of God, and morality, and religion, from the idea of the nature, the existence, and the organic action of human society and government; or that tends to exclude the idea of *duty* to God, to ourselves, and to each other, in its highest moral and religious sense, in the whole conduct of the citizen, considered as such. It is, of course, impossible even for the most elaborate treatises, to discuss and settle, in advance, all the possible contingencies incident to human actions, and all the difficulties that may arise under any line of duty: but to do so would be useless, even if it were possible, as soon as we perceive that all our actions—including those we perform as citizens, come under the idea of duty,—and perceive, further, that we have, in the sacred Scriptures, a rule of all duty at once divine and infallible. And, moreover, in proportion as our duties, from their very nature, become such, that their performance can not be adequately enforced by any outward authority—as, for example, love to God, gratitude to parents, loyalty to the commonwealth, and the like; as soon as we repudiate the only rule of their complete performance which can reach and control the conscience, we, in fact, repudiate the duty itself, and render its adequate performance by us impossible. When we consider how low is the average intelligence of mankind in their natural state, how weak are their moral sensibilities, how erroneous their moral judgments are apt to be, it is easy to see what we are to expect from them as citizens, when they are made to believe that their natural reason and impulses are their only guide in all their conduct as citizens; and easy also to see, how terrible is the responsibility of those religious teachers, who having first betrayed the interests committed to their hands as ministers of God, eagerly urge forward the ruin of their country. If the professed followers of Christ throughout the United States, had been carefully taught, and had well understood and faithfully performed, their duties, as citizens, we suppose it is perfectly certain that the long continued mutual insults and injuries of the extreme sections and factions against each other, and the opposite preposterous claims they set up, could never have become more serious than as merely

local fanaticisms; and that this nation, instead of being drenched in blood, would be now running the glorious career which God had set before it. If the professed ministers of God throughout the United States, had, as a body, proved faithful to their sacred obligations, and had firmly resisted the origin and growth and explosion of the godless fanaticisms, North and South, which are now rioting on the vitals of the nation; no one, we think, can doubt that a moral influence, so great, so pure, and so widely diffused, would have been owned and blessed of God—to the effectual curbing of those frantic impulses, under whose frightful power so large a portion of the American people seem to have lost all just conception of their responsibility to God for their conduct to each other, or to their common country, or to those glorious institutions which they all once professed to revere. And what can be said that will enable posterity to estimate, justly, the race of party leaders, and professional politicians, and self-seeking heads of factions who, during a long course of years, have habitually trifled with the destiny of this great nation, and sedulously nourished every popular misconception that promoted them, and carefully exasperated every dangerous impulse of the people that gave them notoriety? The whirlwind is upon us in all its fury, and who is competent to save us now? This, at least, is a stern consolation—that they who raised it, will perish in it. And this is a solace more becoming to men worthy to save their country, that the time is not yet passed wherein they may settle and proclaim the true and eternal principles on which alone they may look for the divine favor; and, planting themselves there, commit to other ages their justification if they fail; and if they succeed, restore with sublime faith and truth—not another, but the same Union and Constitution. It is by such men alone that we hope for deliverance. It is one set of those everlasting principles that we are now striving to make plain.

God does not leave any of his great designs concerning us, which he desires us to understand, in any obscurity. Purposing to use our race for the accomplishment of objects which exceed the individual powers of man; he creates those subtle and apparently imperishable bonds of race—whereby the whole human family lies under his providence, in a few enor-

mous masses, each mass capable of a distinct and separate use; and he explains, in his blessed Word, the origin and career of each grand division, and of most of the important subdivisions. Then he ordains and establishes and uses, in the course of his providence, that organization which we call state, kingdom, empire, commonwealth; narrating in his Word the career of the chief of them, that existed from the beginning of time to the close of the sacred canon; and recording, in the most explicit terms, his relation to all authorized human government, its relations and duties to its citizens, and their duties toward it. To adduce direct proof of these last statements, we will take some of those made by the Apostle Paul to those whom he calls the beloved of God, called to be saints, in Rome—nay in the very palace, and of the household of Caesar, as we learn from another of his epistles, certain of them were. Nothing could give greater emphasis to the doctrine taught, than the circumstances of this utterance of it. It is a Jew of the highest standing, of the strictest sect—a Hebrew of the Hebrews, who speaks; one of the most enlightened of that wonderful race, whose nationality has survived all that has destroyed every other—and which alone of all the races of the Old World—had, from its origin, the knowledge of the true God and of eternal life. But he was, moreover, in the fallen estate of his own people, by birthright, as he declares, a Roman citizen, and that of no mean city—at the period of the highest grandeur of Rome, when the shadow of her glory and the weight of her power covered the whole earth. And more than all, he was a servant and an apostle of the Divine Redeemer, invested with power, authority and fitness, to take down the outward fabric of the church of God in its Jewish form, and to put it up in its Christian form; and to make known to it, and through it, to all generations, the will of God for the guidance of mankind. God condescends to our weakness and perversity in thus conditioning the plain and authoritative declaration of his will concerning us, in a matter so vital at once to our interests and our duties. And his inspired servant, gathering up the very essence of all past utterances of God on the subject; and deciding of necessity what were then the law of God and the duty of the creature throughout the Roman world, that is throughout the earth,

when he decided what they were at Rome; proclaimed, in the words we are about to quote—with which all Scripture agrees—the rule by which God requires human actions to be regulated, and human belief to be guided, to the end of time:

ROM. xiii: 1. Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be, are ordained of God. 2. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. 3. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: 4. For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. 5. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. 6. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. 7. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. 8. Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. 9. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if *there be* any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. 10. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. 11. And that, knowing the time, that now *it is* high time to wake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. 12. The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light. 13. Let us walk honestly, as in the day: not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. 14. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to *fulfill* the lusts thereof.

This doctrine and these commandments come to us with absolute certainty, and with infinite authority: and they determine with the utmost precision the relation of God to society and government, and the mutual duties of the magistrate and the citizen. Besides the one sacred kingdom of Messiah, of which God is, in a most special sense, the author—there are and have been other kingdoms, nearly without number, in this world. These kingdoms, by means of which human society, which is an ordinance of God, has been manifested under a great variety of aspects, are themselves all ordained of God. This is declared to be true both in the abstract and in the concrete. There is no power but of God: the foundations of human society and government—are the boundless intelligence, the infinite will, and the almighty power of God. Moreover, the possible functions of society, put forth

through any forms, or by means of any body of magistracy, are inherent, and are ordained, limited, and bounded by God: and whoever, in whatever age, and by whatever means, comes to the exercise of these functions, as a magistrate, does so by the providence of God. And this distinction between the abstract idea of civil society and its ordained functions, and the concrete idea of the magistracy at any time in authority, is clearly preserved: for damnation is threatened to those who would destroy society—as if they withstood God himself—while obedience to magistrates is required because they are ministers of God, appointed for the very objects stated by the apostle, and which essentially embrace the fundamental objects of civil society. This, then, is the nature, origin, and authority of civil society, and the civil magistrate.

The duty which God requires of human governments as his ordinance, and of magistrates as his ministers, is stated with equal completeness and precision. They are to be a terror to evil works, not to good works. They are for the praise of all that do good. They must not bear the sword in vain; for, as a minister of God, the magistrate is a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Both the state and the magistrate, are obliged to look to the support and prosperity of organized society, in all that relates to “custom” and “tribute”—the wide and indispensable financial necessities of this institute of God. In all this, they are entitled to due obedience, honor, fear, respect, and reverence; and this as matter of conscience, and out of the love of the citizen; the magistrate being entitled thereto, partly by reason of his office, and still further by reason of the fidelity, assiduity, and success, with which he attends continually on the things it is his duty to do. To protect, to nourish, to advance all good actions and good men; to restrain and punish all evil actions and evil men; to preserve and to guide unto its high and just ends, by righteous, wise, and necessary means, that ordinance of God which we call civil society; this is the design of civil government—the duty of civil magistrates.

The corresponding obligations laid by God upon the citizen, are still more largely stated. The apostle begins by enjoining upon every soul, obedience to all human authority to which we are subject; a command so comprehensive and so distinctive

of revealed religion, that he who is not “a law-abiding man” can not be a child of God. And he gives, at once, the very highest religious reason for the command—by a double appeal to God. And at the first pause in the divine progress of his discourse, he announces that our subjection—in opposition to all ideas of licentious and capricious freedom from restraint, is one of those overwhelming “*needs be*” which the Scriptures so often suggest; and adds two reasons why we should willingly acquiesce in the command of God; namely, *first* the certainty of punishment if we will not, and *secondly* our conscientious obligation to do so. Expanding this wide doctrine of obedience, we are forbidden to resist this ordinance of God, whether in its abstract or its concrete, under the double threat of damnation—and of the magistrate—as before explained; it is shown that if we would escape fear of the law and the ruler, we must do good and not evil; we are warned that, as God’s minister, the civil magistrate must cherish us—or must punish us—as we are good or evil—that is obedient or disobedient; he commands us to discharge all our dues and obligations, of whatever kind, to the State, to the law, to the magistrate, and to all men—to do this in a frame of mind responsive to the duties we owe—to make conscience of doing it—to do it in strong affection—to do it as duty pertaining unto our salvation—as those who cast off all the works of darkness, and put on the armor of light—nay, who put on the Lord Jesus Christ!

Without deeming it necessary to cite other passages of Scripture, to confirm and illustrate the one we have printed, and briefly analyzed, to a certain extent; we must say that this passage of God’s Word seems to us to put the relation of civil society, of the magistrate, and of the citizen, to God, and to each other, in such a light that men must deny the authority of the word of God, or be totally ignorant of what it teaches on the subject we are discussing, or be perfectly reckless in what they advance or accept; before the follies, the heresies, and the enormities, which signalize our generation, could ever have gained acceptance as a justification of the sins against God, and the crimes against society, under which the land groans. We shall not, however, break the continuity of this inquiry, in order to expose those fatal delusions.

Human society, then, is a determinate institute ordained of God, whose safety and perpetuity he has hedged around with the most precise commands, and the severest threats. Civil government in the abstract, which is ordained of God in a secondary manner, is the necessary result of the determinate nature of society; a result which is inevitable, upon the organization and organic action of society. And a body of magistracy—(whether all the freemen as in a small democracy, or the sovereign in an empire, or anything between the two)—are ordained of God to constitute the government, practically; and are brought into power, under his special providence. The determinate functions of society are precisely and scientifically assignable; and consist of the exercise of its will (law-making); the exercise of its intelligence (judicial exposition of laws, rights, duties); and the exercise of its power (executive enforcement of law). Nor is it of any consequence, how variously these functions may be performed, united, or divided, so far as concerns the absolute nature of the case: it is still society, still a government, still a magistracy. Society itself being, so to speak, the concrete of man, these inherent functions of society, are identical in their essential nature, with the corresponding faculties in man; namely, that intelligence by which he knows God, that will by which he chooses God, and that power by which he obeys God. And man himself, being a created image and likeness of God, these human faculties are shadows of those infinite attributes of God, which distinguish him as a personal Spirit; namely, his intelligence which is the source of all other intelligence—his will which is supreme throughout the universe, and conformity to which is the measure of all perfection—and his power which is omnipotent, and the source of all other power, and the cause of all secondary causes, from eternity to eternity. We therefore clearly see how God, making known to us his ordination of human society, makes a distinction between his relation to the abstract and the concrete; that is, to society itself, and to the magistracy; which distinction we have before pointed out. We see, also, how the allegiance of the citizen, if due to the *magistrate only*, would stand on a widely different ground from that it occupies when considered due to *society itself*. We see, also, how society itself is necessarily supreme over every

species of magistracy, and over all forms and kinds of particular institutions, administered by any sort of magistracy. We see, also, how an actual government and magistracy stand related to society, in widely different ways, when on one hand the government exists under a constitution solemnly enacted by society, and the magistracy is chosen by society, or when on the other, society has never given more than an implied consent, if any consent at all, either to one or the other. And, finally, we see how, in a free commonwealth, with such institutions, and such a magistracy as exist with us, society, and government, and magistracy are so nearly related and identified, that forcible resistance to the government or the magistracy is more difficult to be distinguished from resistance to society itself; while rebellion against the constitution, or deliberate subversion of its authority, in any way whatever, whether by the magistrate or the citizen, must be considered as next in atrocity to that direct attack on society itself, which God has so strictly forbidden. There is, however, an aggravation even of this, under our constitutions, which we will explain in another connection.

We have incidentally mentioned the kingdom of God in this world, which, from its adorable Head, is called the Messianic Kingdom—from the mode in which it exists under the power of the Holy Spirit is called the New Creation—and from its members and their relation to the Saviour is called the Church of Christ. Under its present form, the church militant is a visible society made up of the professed disciples of Christ—and being a society of human beings is subject to the same inherent laws, and is invested with the same organic functions, that we have pointed out in the case of civil society. The objects of the existence of this society, however, are different from, and paramount to, those for which civil society is ordained; and God has, therefore, limited and bounded the exercise of its organic functions, and regulated the powers and duties of its office-bearers, and ordained the government in the hands of these office-bearers—by divine command—in a manner suitable to the particular nature and end of this society. It is striking, and highly illustrative of what has been said before, to compare the Christian and the civil institutes with each other. In the former, the essential sovereignty

is in the Lord Jesus Christ, not in the society itself as in the latter; so that whereas the will of the civil society is made known by its laws for the regulation of the conduct of its citizens—the will of the Christian society is swallowed up in the will of God, made known in the sacred Scriptures, and its legislative function is suppressed. With regard to the judicial function of society, it is in full exercise in the Christian as in the civil commonwealth; the difference being in the subject matter of its exercise, the civil interpreting and applying its own laws, the Christian interpreting and applying only the law of God. Touching the executive function, the same state of case exists as in the judicial function; but with some peculiarities. For, in civil society, the execution and enforcement is each complete after its manner, while in Christian society, as the authority of all decisions depends on their being in conformity with the will of God, so their efficacy depends upon the power of the Holy Spirit. And as to the form that civil society may put on, in the nature of government and institutions—an immense latitude is allowed by God to civil societies—though the one he himself ordained for his ancient people, was singularly free: while, according to our apprehension, he has left no latitude at all to Christian society, as to the fundamental nature of its government and institutions—but has ordained them himself, in the nature of a free spiritual commonwealth. It will be seen at once that the jurisdiction of the Christian commonwealth is purely moral and spiritual, extending to everything concerning which the idea of *duty* exists—and just so far as that idea goes; while its appeal being to God and the human conscience—the right of private judgment is necessarily sacred—and every one who sees fit to take the risk, may leave the church, and adjourn over his case to the bar of God, and the day of judgment. From the nature of civil society, no such right of private judgment can exist, in such a way as to be peacefully operative; for its common exercise would render the existence of civil society impossible, by arresting the temporal effects of all its acts—whereas there can be no other but temporal effects from any of its acts. We can easily see that paramount obedience to God, may make it our *duty* to refuse obedience to wicked laws of man; but it is a perversion of terms and of sense to call this a *right*, in any other

sense than that we have a right to do our duty; and it is absurd to talk about this Christian duty of obeying God rather than man, being a natural right, much less a civil right, in whose discretionary exercise, treason, rebellion, and anarchy cease to be either sins or crimes. It will be easily seen, also, how essentially demoralizing and licentious all that teaching is, which releases civil society from the obligation of making obedience to the known will of God concerning its own nature and acts—the rule of all its conduct; and which releases the government and the citizen, or either of them, from the obligation of enforcing and obeying the fundamental institutions of the particular society, and all laws made in accordance with them. But perhaps the most senseless, immoral, and destructive part of such abominable teaching, is that which aims to silence the Church of God as a universal teacher of moral duty—and to strip her of the very essence of her mission, as the witness for Christ. God has made her the light of the world: these men would put out her light: do they desire that, in the gross darkness, sin and crime might hold carnival together? God has made her the salt of the earth: these men would rob her of her savor: can they wish that every temporal interest of man might perish in anarchy—that all by which life is made a blessing, might rot in licentiousness?

Holding carefully to the distinctions we have pointed out—and to the clear statements of the Scriptures, which we have printed and expounded on previous pages, we avoid many perplexing questions, by bearing in mind, that the divine doctrine of society, of government, and of the citizen, delivered by the great apostle, is not laid down by him simply as a theory upon which a world or even a nation may be started; but is propounded, with divine authority, as an exposition of an actual world, full of nations in complete and long continued possession and exercise of the things of which he taught. As if he had said, concerning these things which are, in effect, common to the human race, this is what God has done; and this is what he has always required and will always require—and this is the significance of the whole matter. Man can not help being of some race, and community, and country, any more than he can help being human. They are

a part of each individual's earthly existence. And however variable some of the elements may appear to be in reality, they are as permanent as the human race is, in this world. It is simply impossible for any one to change his race; and the numbers of human kind that ever changed their country or their nation, bear no assignable proportion to the numbers who do not; and all who do, bear with them, of necessity, whatever their race has made them—and transfer, to the utmost of their ability, and transmit to other ages, all the characteristics of the home and the institutions they left behind. Nor are there any deeper, or more universal, or more ennobling impulses of our nature than profound sympathy of race, and fervent love of country, and earnest veneration of ancestral institutions. Nor is there a surer human guaranty for the preservation of whatever attainments the human race can make, than the tenacity with which it cherishes these impulses. We see, therefore, that God does not ordain the things whereof we speak, to be transient and inconstant. Nationalities are the growths of many generations; ours is the growth of two and a half centuries on this continent, and of a thousand previous years in the old world. God did not ordain society in such a way, that they who compose it might lightly cast themselves loose from it. And the providence of God has hedged us about with such innumerable difficulties in the way of all disloyalty, that in ordinary times, and in well-ordered states, its wide existence may be said to be impossible. And so strong is the natural instinct which God has implanted in us, fitting us for the ordinances which he has fitted for us—that sound-hearted men are obliged to be deluded with a pretext of loyalty before they allow themselves to be disloyal. We are satisfied that the delusion that, under our complex system of government, our supreme allegiance is due, and our supreme affections should be given, to the states of which we are citizens, rather than to the nation which those states unitedly constitute—lies at the bottom of most that can be extenuated, in the present rebellion. But we need not pursue these ideas, just now, beyond what is necessary to direct attention to the proof which God has laid in our very nature, confirmatory of the stability of his ordinances—and the perpetuity of the ties that bind us to them—and the immorality and untruthfulness

of all opposite interpretations. For the evil which is raging around us, is by so much the more astonishing and atrocious, as the white population of this country is altogether the most homogeneous and enlightened that ever existed in as great numbers, in any free nation. Nor do we suppose a single faithful American citizen lives, who did not once believe that our country was out of the reach of the particular calamities which have overtaken her, and free from all danger of the particular form of ruin which now threatens her. How terribly, then, does it import us, to understand the true remedy for such misery!

Where a community exists, and is manifested in a way that God allows; where the nature and form of its institutions are also such, as in his wide indulgence to us, he sanctions; and where the magistracy are in power by the ordinary and established action of society, under the controlling providence of God, the regular and lawful action of the government is under the special sanction of the Almighty, and all resistance to that action, by arms, is equally a folly, a sin, and a crime. This was our condition; it is the ordinary condition of all communities, even partially civilized, in all ages; and internal peace, security, and order are the great blessings which ordinarily attend it—all of which are temporarily forfeited, and put at permanent risk, by every forcible attempt at change. These forcible attempts, from within, have marked every age, and have occurred in every nation—now, finally, among ourselves. In general, the judgment of mankind concerning them, has depended more on their failure or success than on their nature and objects; and succeeding ages have not possessed the means of revising many of these judgments. Great nations have generally survived them, and grown greater; weak states have generally perished, and fallen victims, by reason of them, to states that were more powerful. Upon the whole, the fate of all seditions and rebellions, taken together, has been disastrous to the human race—contributing little to its permanent advancement, and making no compensation, by the evils they may have destroyed, for those they inflicted. If a few signal exceptions may be found, they will turn out, on careful examination, to have been really national movements—or outbursts of long continued struggles between

heterogeneous races—rather than revolts against society, or seditious risings against established governments. Of the former kind may be said to be the English Revolution of 1688, which saved both the nation and the laws, and the American Revolution of 1776 which gave organic life to our nationality, which is now sought to be destroyed; and of the latter kind, the forcible separation of Belgium and Holland, which the whole power of Europe had absurdly forced to unite. We have before our eyes, in the case of France, a great nation, starting with a bloody and ferocious revolution, more than seventy years ago, and after passing through every possible form of government—including three royal dynasties—landing in an Imperial Despotism. Did the drenching her land in blood, did the decimating her population by war, by the public executioner, and by private butcheries—did the conquest of the greater part of Europe, and then her own subjugation—did her standing menace against the peace of the world, and the independence of nations; did all that has occurred since 1789, tend, in the least, to secure France against further revolutions, after diligently following revolution, as a pursuit, for three-quarters of a century? Or, to draw instruction from our own recent experience, can any wise and just man doubt that it would have been ten thousand times better for this nation, and for every real interest of it, if this revolt and civil war had never occurred? Or, can he see, nay, can he conjecture, any possible result of things as they now stand, that can ever compensate for the mischief already done—the misery already inflicted? We see, therefore, that it is of the ordination of God, and is in the order of nature and society, as well as providence, that the progress of mankind is not the achievement of armed factions; that institutions are not ameliorated by sedition and anarchy; that revolt, and revolution, and treason, have no tendency to promote reform, much less to establish security, freedom, or civilization. These are outrages—not remedies. Outrages abhorrent to society as ordained of God—to every end for which civil government exists—to every interest, and every right, and every duty of the citizen. Nor are there any obligations binding on magistrates higher than that they forbore to drive men to such extremities—by folly, by injustice, or by

oppression; and that they exert the whole power with which they are clothed, to protect society against such destructive crimes.

Whatever tendency to decay and ignorance may be supposed to exist in a fallen race, when left to itself, the actual posture of mankind is not one in which they are thus left to themselves; but, on the contrary, is one in which boundless elements of progress exist profusely. It is their right, their interest, their duty to profit by this condition: and that in regard to their civil institutions, as zealously as in regard to anything else. We have already shown that God has placed civil society in a certain condition of supremacy over its own institutions—and has allowed it a latitude of choice, which he has denied to the corresponding Christian community, in determining the form of civil government—as democratic, or republican, or monarchical, or mixed. In practice, all forms, and nearly all modifications of them all, may be said to have been chosen, or at least acquiesced in, by society; and the judgment of the wisest and truest lovers of human progress, would probably be, that there are conditions of the human race to which each form is most suitable. To make, at will, a transition from one of these forms to any other—is a divine right of society itself; in opposition to the singularly absurd claim of the divine right of some particular form, or dynasty, to hold society in endless subjection. And all forcible attempts on the part of the existing form, or reigning dynasty, or magistrates in power, or portions of the community, to prevent society from making the transit it desires—is one form of that resistance to society which God has expressly forbidden. And as the *supreme* allegiance of the citizen is due, neither to the form, nor to the dynasty, nor to the magistrate, nor to any faction, but to the commonwealth itself—the real sovereign; it is his duty not only to acquiesce in the determination of that true sovereign to make the transit—but also to resist every attempt that may be made to defeat the execution of that purpose. If war occurs in the progress of such lawful and authorized acts on the part of the sovereign community—it is just of the same character as war undertaken to subjugate society in any other way; and armed enforcement of these supreme rights of civil society, accords with the will

of God, and is even more highly the duty of the magistrate and the citizen, than armed enforcement of ordinary laws. The only difficulty is the speculative one—as to what really constitutes society in this supreme aspect—and as to the means by which its supreme will must be made known. The more complete the development of society becomes, the more completely this difficulty vanishes; and we have the remarkable fact, that God's ordinances concerning these immense interests of man, are not merely the only clear and comprehensive disposition ever made of the whole subject—but they become more practical and more fundamental, the higher is the advancement of society;—more readily and effectually applicable to the complex problems of the nineteenth Christian century, than to the simple ones of the first Christian century, or the rude ones of the earliest historic century before Christ. By whatever means it can be ascertained, who is a citizen in any particular country, by the same means it is made certain, what is the body in which the legal sovereignty resides. It is a question not without difficulty, in most civilized countries, how far the safety of the state will permit, the citizens and the adult male population to be numerically identical; or how far, on the other hand, that safety will allow a ruling class to press—without fatal reaction—the disfranchisement of the lower classes. And certainly it is a question, which all disfranchised classes in all civilized states may well ponder, how far they are allowed by God to proceed in forcing their enfranchisement; or if they be, as they generally are, the numerical majority, how far they are to be justified in vindicating their claim to be the very society which God has ordained—and whose rights the privileged classes have usurped. These are all questions, however, which lie on that extreme verge, where the imperfect stage of human progress, makes it difficult for complete truth to have free scope. They are questions which have no relevancy to American affairs; for they are settled here, by written constitutions, and by immemorial tendency in one direction. In other nations, we are furnished with a great variety of solutions of them. In France, for example, with the singular combination of universal suffrage on the part of the people, and irresponsible and nearly unlimited power on the part of the Emperor;

a combination so prolific of mischief, that even half a million of soldiers, and the gratification of every national passion by the present Emperor, may *possibly* not allow that great ruler to transmit his crown to his race. In England, we have the example of the most protracted struggle which history affords, between the mutually conflicting claims of the people, the privileged classes, and the crown, resulting in a limited monarchy, with the most distinguished aristocracy in the world, and only a fraction of the adult male population enfranchised, and the sovereignty nominally vested in the popular branch of an omnipotent Parliament—but really in the public opinion of that whole English population, which, upon extremity, is the fiercest and most turbulent in Europe. Yet no one can compare the France and England which the Romans subdued, with the France and England of the present day, without confessing a progress as remarkable as was ever made, under difficulties as great as were ever surmounted. And as we ponder such examples of the triumphs which even the imperfect exercise of the powers inherent in society may win—and which even the insufficient application of the divine principles we are discussing may make imperishable; we ought to rise, with a sublime confidence, above our immediate perils and calamities. It is not by fatal concessions to armed destroyers of our national life—nor by equally fatal acquiescence in the destruction of our constitutional liberty and security—that we dare hope for triumph. It is by a faithful adherence to the truth God has taught us, and by a true obedience to the commands he has laid on us, with respect to the very matters now hanging on wager of battle; that our courage, our fortitude, our faithfulness to our trust, our justice, our wisdom, our heroic moderation, may be relied on as the sure means of such a triumph as God will approve, and all coming ages magnify!

We have spoken, in a former paragraph, of certain heinous offenses against society being aggravated, when the provisions of our American constitution, which remove all occasion, and nearly all temptation, to committing them—are considered. And in the last paragraph, we have spoken of the determinate and sovereign settlement in those constitutions—of the difficulties, which, everywhere else, and in all ages, have proved such formidable obstacles to society in passing from one form

of government to another, or even in liberalizing and perfecting their institutions, without changing the general nature of the government. This state of fact appears to us to be so important, and to place the duty of the citizen of a free commonwealth, organized on the principles of all our American constitutions, on such a basis; that all irregular opposition to a fair government, and all forcible resistance of just laws, assume a turpitude unknown in other countries; nay, that violence on the part of the citizen, which might be excused, or even justified, under other forms of government, does not admit of any extenuation under ours. For let it be remembered, that the constitution of the United States is the formal and sovereign will of the people of the United States, deliberately expressed, solemnly ratified, and steadfastly adhered to for nearly three-quarters of a century. And let it be further remembered, that the nation not only had, what all men admit to be an absolute right, but, as we think we have proved, a divine right, to make that constitution, to establish that close and perpetual union under it, and to set up the form of government, and to ordain the magistracy which is created by it. Therefore, these things are all unalterable and supreme, each in its sphere, while they continue to be the last sovereign expression of the will of the nation—that is, until the nation shall, with equal formality and distinctness, make known its sovereign will to change one, or other, or all—the Constitution—the Union—the Government—the Magistracy. Now, if the sovereign acts had ceased at this point, the indefeasible right of this society, as of all others, still remained, no doubt, to pass onward, at whatever time society should resolve to do so, and by new formal and sovereign acts, equal in dignity and force with those formerly performed, to do anything society may lawfully do, under the ordination of God. But, in attempting this, or even in attempting much lower changes in its institutions, under such circumstances, which, vague as they might be accounted, are much more precise than the general conditions of societies in which important changes have been attempted; we should have been obliged to run the gravest risks, and to encounter the most serious dangers. But our sovereign acts did not cease at the point indicated. On the contrary, the federal constitution—like all our American

constitutions—makes express provision for its own amendment, and points out how this shall be done. This natural right of society of which men speak so much—this divine ordinance of God which we have proved—has been taken by the fathers of American liberty, and made a civil and constitutional right, and its orderly exercise secured by exact provisions. From that moment it is *voting*, and not *fighting*; that should determine all things. From the beginning of time till that moment, it had been fighting and not voting—which had determined all changes in human society. We are in the midst, therefore, of the most aggravated treason of which it is possible to conceive, from a speculative point of view; and practically so atrocious is it, that without a pretext having, originally, even an appearance of justification for attacking anything by force—everything—society itself, the national life, the constitution of the nation, the union of the states, the government existing in the country, the laws made in pursuance of the constitution, and all the magistracy in whose hands is the making, the exposition, and the enforcement of those laws—everything is set upon with a fury never exceeded in the annals of mankind. And to make the event utterly disgraceful to the age in which it occurred, two of the three greatest nations in the world—England and France—have manifestly desired the success of a treason so detestable; and, claiming to be at the very summit of Christian civilization, have shown an eagerness for the failure of our great destiny, which would have been shameful in the most debased peoples, an eagerness, as yet hardly kept in bounds by the enormous force this nation has shown itself capable of putting forth, and which they will not restrain a moment after they believe its flagrant indulgence may be gratified without extreme peril. May God reward them, in his good time and way!

It is, perhaps, important to clear up somewhat further the chief idea developed in the preceding paragraph—and some others of very great importance closely related to it. As we have already said several times, God has allowed very great latitude to society, as to the mode in which its inherent functions should make themselves manifest; and it can not be denied that, while his Gospel may have free scope under every possible form, so also every possible form is capable of being

turned to the exclusion of that Gospel; any more than it can be denied, that the personal knowledge of God unto salvation, is capable of reaching the individual soul, in every condition in which a human being can exist in this world; and we may add, the proportion of human conditions which men visited with divine grace must afterward forsake, or lose the grace of God, is extremely small compared with all possible conditions, whether we take the Word of God simply, or that Word as expounded by his gracious dealings with men, as the rule of judgment. What is the best form human society can put on, in order to answer best the ends of its divine institutions, may, perhaps, be answered well enough by saying, that form is best for each particular society which will most effectually put the powers of the state in the hands of those most fit to exercise them, and will the most permanently keep them there. Not long ago, nearly all Americans would have said, the freer the form a people can be trusted with, the better: and one of the terrible evils of our present condition, is the doubt that it seems to cast over the security and permanence of free institutions—and the pretext thus afforded for arresting the progress of personal liberty in all countries. We suppose, however, that even yet, few will be found anywhere, mad enough to deny that free institutions, such as are presented under the constitution and laws of the United States, are allowed by God to those who desire them. This is all the admission our present argument requires. Under such institutions, the whole body of the magistracy is elected by the greater part of the citizens—and the continued existence of the institutions of the country, in the form at any time presented by them, depends upon the adherence to them, in that form, of the great body of the citizens. Now, if any portion of the citizens of a free state, less than the majority—nay, we might say less than the constitutional majority—is at liberty to revolt against the magistrates, to defy the laws, to overthrow the constitution, to break up the national life, to subvert society; their right to do so, under such government, is a conclusive proof that free governments are incompatible with the existence of society, and in opposition to the will of God; for God has forbidden such actions in that society ordained by him! It is far more; it is incontestable proof

that no form of government, except unlimited, hereditary despotism, pure and simple, is possible, consistently with the rights of man, the nature of society, or the will of God. The right of five millions to despise and subvert the rights of twenty-two millions—is the right of two to treat eight in the same way—and still more clearly the right of the stronger of the two to treat the weaker in the same way. It is the dogmatic establishment of *force*, as the only rule of right; the dogmatic establishment of human passion and caprice as the sole direction of force; the dogmatic establishment of uncontrollable violence, as the final result of all human experience, and all possible human attainment! And we confidently assert, that it is impossible to acknowledge the right of secession, by the exercise of which every rebel state commenced the disintegration of American society; without terminating, as a moral result, in simple atheism, as to any assignable relation of God to human society; and without terminating in zero-*nil*, anarchy, the utter impossibility of society, as the result, both scientific and practical, of human rights and human authority, brought face to face. This is the residuum we get, when we suppress the sublime idea of *duty*, in the maturing of our principles, and the ordering of our lives, touching these vast subjects. And when fraud, and terror, and violence, are the means by which the first step—the secession—is taken; the case presented is, not a delusion, but a conspiracy; and the horror of its conclusion, is responsive to the atrocity of its beginning.

It is in vain that the force of these truths is sought to be broken, or evaded, by claiming that under our system of government the paramount allegiance of the citizen is due to the particular state, and not to the nation; and is due to the nation at all only through the state; and only so long as the state shall require the citizen to render it. Of the three propositions which make up this argument, and terminate in the conclusion that each state may secede when it sees fit, the two former might possibly be true, while the third one, and the conclusion, would remain utterly false. If it were true that each state was sovereign and independent before it became one of the constituent elements of the nation; and further true, that its sovereign act adhering to the nation, was

the only original ground of the allegiance of its citizens to the nation; that sovereign act, when performed, is *functus officio*, final, and irrevocable by any subsequent act of the particular state; and whatever allegiance was due to it, is irrevocably transferred to the nation; and every attempt of the particular state to undo its former sovereign act by secession, or otherwise, is not only immoral and traitorous, but is utterly absurd, seeing that its last act of paramount sovereignty, was to merge that separate sovereignty in the paramount national sovereignty. But both the preceding statements of the proposition on which the secession conclusion rests—are utterly destitute of truth, whether historical, legal, or theoretical. There is not a state that is, or ever was, in the American Union, that ever existed for one moment, as a separate state clothed with paramount sovereignty; not one that ever existed as a *state* at all, otherwise than as one of the United States; just as there never was any such nation as the United States, except as constituted of sovereign states—those very states that issued unitedly the Declaration of American Independence in 1776, together with the numerous territories which have been admitted into the Union as states, by act of Congress, at their request. These facts are just as certain, as that there is an American people in the world. And the existing constitution of the United States, being based upon these undeniable historic truths, recognizes them all—is made expressly in the sense of all of them and of the consequences which flow from them, and is neither intelligible nor capable of execution, except on the supposition of their reality. That constitution is on its face, and in its form, a *government not a treaty*. It is one nation, settling its institutions by the will of its people; not many nations, arranging terms and conditions of peace, amity, and alliance. By it, the peculiar nature, and the boundaries of the national powers and duties, are determined; and the peculiar relations of the nation and the states, to each other, and to the people, are defined. And settling forever every question upon which such pretensions as we are now exposing, could be rationally based, it expressly declares that constitution, and the laws enacted, and the treaties made in pursuance of it, to be the supreme law of the land—naming state constitutions and laws as nullities when

they conflict with this supreme law; expressly prohibits to the states, the exercise of those functions which are inseparable from supreme sovereignty—such as the power to declare war, to make peace, to coin money, to make treaties—and such like; and expressly vests these, and similar powers inseparable from paramount sovereignty, in the government of the United States. It seems to us that nothing could be clearer. And yet this pretext of paramount state authority—shown to be totally absurd in its conclusion, even if its main terms were true, and those main terms shown to be totally false; has probably done more harm in confusing the minds of men, in becoming an instrument in the hands of despotic and unscrupulous local power, in furnishing to the timid and time-serving a decent excuse, and in affording unreasonable scope to state pride and local attachments; than could be conceived by those who have not had occasion to observe its immense diffusion, and the confidence with which it is always urged. From it also springs the chief pretext used by disloyal teachers of morals in the loyal states, who as a body are fearfully responsible for the errors and sins of the times, whereby the church of God is attempted to be silenced, as the moral guide of mankind. They put it thus: the whole question of this civil war, is merely one of construction of the federal constitution; does it or does it not allow secession? which being a question purely of political criticism, concerning which the church does not know the mind of God, has no authority from him to speak. These evils the triumph of the nation should cure, and put an end to the doctrine and practice of secession, and to the follies and miseries which follow in its course. But that very triumph may lead to an opposite evil, not less surely fatal at last, than secession itself; and means have already been resorted to, in the alleged impatience to hurry that triumph, and make it signal, which may make the effects of that evil both sudden and vehement. It is as strictly true that there is no American nation except as it is constituted of these states, as it is that there are no American states except as they constitute this nation. The nation has no more right to expel, or destroy a state, or usurp its rights, than a state has to expel or secede from the nation, or usurp its rights. In one respect the power of the state is more plenary, than

that of the nation; for the nation has no power, under its present constitution, except what that constitution gives, and what is incidental thereto; whereas all the powers inherent in society are given by the state constitutions, except so far as, by themselves, or by the federal constitution, any powers are withheld. While their sovereignty is not paramount, as we have shown, their scope is far wider and more varied. This is our system: the wisest, the noblest, the nearest to the double perfection of immense public force, united with the highest personal security and freedom—ever produced in the mere course of human progress. There are ideas afloat among eminent leaders of the party now in power—which are directly subversive of this system of government; directly incompatible with that indispensable element of it, which is contributed by the power, the dignity, the sovereignty, and the security of the states. And these ideas have to a large extent, hardened into acts of Congress—and matured into avowed principles, for the conduct of the war; while others, clearly related to them, are habitually advocated in both houses of Congress, in the most important state papers, and in many ably-conducted newspapers. The triumph of these ideas, is a wholly different thing from the triumph of the nation in this war. The nation may, we trust will, triumph in this war, in defiance of these ideas. But there will remain the necessity of another national triumph over these ideas—no matter in what posture they may then be found; or the nation must take the risk of a future career radically incompatible with the federal constitution; and therefore radically different from all its past career.

It is now well known that the outbreak of the civil war, preceded by successive acts of secession on the part of many states, had long been contemplated, and awaited only a favorable conjuncture of affairs. It was a conspiracy, matured through a long course of years, pointing to the division of the nation, and the erection of a new nation intended to include, if possible, all the slave states, and to extend itself indefinitely south and west over the Spanish and Indian country, and seaward over as many of the West India islands as might be possible. There can be no doubt, that it was designed to make negro slavery universal in the new nation; but that is widely

different from saying, that slavery was the original, or only serious, cause of the conspiracy; widely different from saying, that the body of the slaveholders favored the conspiracy before it broke out into secession, or favored the secession because the secession was on account of slavery; widely different from saying, that slavery must be destroyed, as a condition precedent to the restoration of the Union. So far as the slave states may have had any idea of the insecurity of slave property, under the federal constitution, arising from the long, persistent, and deeply offensive movements against it at the North, beginning with the opposition to the admission of Missouri in 1819, and extending over forty years, to the accidental triumph of the republican party in 1860; those states had resented, and resisted, and triumphed over those northern movements, with great political skill and hardihood, and a growing extravagance in their demands—which rendered it impossible they could have doubted—that the republican triumph of 1860, was accidental and temporary, perfectly controllable during the four years of power by that party, if the South had not seceded, and politically certain of being reversed in 1864, by any one of numerous possible combinations of the whole fifteen slave states, with a certain number of the nineteen free states. What is very certain is, that the American people have never set the seal of their approbation, to the *extreme* demands made in the interest, either of slavery or anti-slavery; nor do we believe they ever will do either. They rebuked, and for the time crushed, the party that seduced the administration of Mr. Buchanan, besides many other iniquities, into the support of the wildest pro-slavery claims; and, whoever is observant of the effects produced on the public mind, everywhere, by Mr. Lincoln's proclamations of September 22d and 24th, 1862, and January 1st, 1863, and the various acts of the Congress which has just terminated, which sustain the principles of those proclamations—can hardly doubt the conclusion which the American people will announce in 1864. This, at least, is certain—that neither the union of the states, under any constitution whatever, nor the preservation of peace, liberty, security, public order, under the present constitution, is permanently possible—after the American people shall have deliberately approved the abuse of the national

power either to the maintenance and spread of slavery in America, or to the universal liberation of the negro slaves, and their elevation to civil and social equality with the whites. It is certainly very deplorable, that the present policy of the country toward slavery should appear to furnish the rebel states with a terrible proof in support of the main reason attributed to them for seceding; and that this proof should be created by the acts of the very party whose access to power offered the occasion of the revolt.

Posterity will judge whether apprehensions of the security of their slave property, was the cause of their secession; we think, and on several occasions have endeavored to show, that they were not in more than a slight degree, if at all. Posterity will, also, judge whether, if they were, the present policy of the federal government does not go far to prove their apprehensions may have been just—although the mode which they took to obtain security, was at once sinful and absurd; while, if they were not, and the present national policy admits of some other explanation, posterity may well marvel that the safety of so great a nation could be supposed to depend on official acts, the effects of which no human being could calculate, and the power to perform which, loudly and everywhere denied, no man has attempted to demonstrate—further than by wild and incoherent assertions about “*belligerent rights*.” No matter what was the actual state of the case—or of apprehension about it; the mode of security sought by the seceding states—as we have abundantly shown, was wholly without excuse; and that all the more, because there were not only other and adequate means, which were peaceful and regular, as we have also shown; but, because, the successful use of *force*, in the union, and *under* the constitution, in resisting illegal violence and wrong, no matter in what sacred name they might be used, remained to them, at the last extremity. Deeming it a necessary part of this inquiry to explain that aspect of the general subject, this paragraph was needful, in order to present the point with precision, before discussing it. Before proceeding to do so, we will merely add further: *first*, that the steadfast obstinacy with which the leaders of the secession party, and the first states that seceded, refused even to listen to counsel on this subject—proved how much more deeply

their purpose rested, than upon any mere apprehensions of danger which, by remaining, they might restrain—and at the end of four years, remove; and, *secondly*, that our conviction is unshaken, that if this distinction had been adopted, which rejects secession, and asserts the right of the citizen to armed and combined self-defense against illegal violence *in* the union and *under* the constitution—the country would have been saved from the miseries of the past two years, and from the perils of its present position.

Any just consideration of the passage of sacred Scripture which we have printed and expounded, in the former part of this inquiry, shows that the duties of each party therein set forth, have relations which are direct and mutual to the other parties, all of which are enforced by the responsibility of all the parties to God. This responsibility to God is not all—but it is supreme. It exceeds all power that is not divine, either to change or release it. Whosever duty it is to evangelize the world, to administer discipline in the Church of God, and to expound truth, duty, and faith unto eternal life; it is theirs, eminently, to expound and to press upon all men, everywhere, the nature and obligation of this responsibility, along with every other we owe to God. And all communities, all magistrates, and every citizen, in the exercise of every power by the first, in the performance of every act by the second, in the whole conduct of the third, are so far disobedient to God, and so far incur his displeasure, as they lose sight of this responsibility, or intentionally disregard it. By his providence in this world, and by his sentence in the day of judgment, God undertakes to see his glory and his dominion vindicated, and the wickedness of the disobedient punished—and the obedience of the righteous abundantly blessed. Now, upon the mere statement of the case, in this aspect of it, no one can doubt that if the revealed will of God were obeyed, with a perfect heart by men, no difficulty could arise in the conduct of human affairs, beyond such as might temporarily occur through the natural ignorance or weakness of man. Moreover, it is manifest that taking our race as it is, while no man is allowed by God to do wrong with impunity—every man is allowed, nay is encouraged by God, to *suffer* wrong, to the whole extent that fidelity in his lot, and the keeping of a good

conscience toward God and toward men, will permit, before he undertakes to redress himself or others. And, finally, it is clear that as there are limits beyond which our responsibility to God does not require us to endure grievous and intolerable wrong; so, also, there are requirements which may be made of us by the civil law, or the civil magistrate, which God absolutely forbids us to comply with; as, for example, every human command which requires us to violate the command of God. We see, therefore, that by our responsibility to God, and by the express command of God, there are, at the least, two classes of cases, in the former of which *passive obedience* is not required, and in the latter of which it is forbidden. As to the *form* of the resistance, there is little choice left, in general, to the victim. Nor, as to the principle involved, does it make any difference, whether he perishes at the stake or triumphs on the field of battle. The grand principle we reach is, that both the doctrine of *divine right* as applied to the magistrate, and the doctrine of *passive obedience* as applied to the citizen are contrary to the Word of God, and incompatible with the safety, the purity, or the progress of that divine institute which we call society. God, in ordaining positive institutions for a fallen and depraved race, has made the irregular and effectual application of force, drawn not from the existing government or magistracy, but directly from the bosom of society; a lawful and permanent resort for the safety both of society and the citizen, under the workings of intolerable institutions, laws, or magistracy. It is a very striking result; and discloses how much closer is the bond between society and the citizen—the two permanent elements—than the bond between either of them and the particular institutions or the particular magistracy—the two transient elements of what we call the state. And we venture to express our strong assurance, that whoever will carefully compare the statements of this paragraph, with the abundant teachings of the sacred Scriptures on this important topic, will find that all we have done is to give an imperfect summary, of sound and wholesome doctrine, too little understood. We do not see how the conclusion can be resisted, that while all attempts at the destruction of American society, and our national life, are contrary to the revealed will of God—as has been proved; it is, at the same time true, that

cases might arise in which armed opposition to particular laws, or a particular body of magistracy, would be permitted, or even required, by God; and that one element of that which is inexcusable, is that it begins by renouncing the Constitution and the Union—while one element of that which, in extremity, God approves, is that it occurs in the Union and under the Constitution, and for the greater security of both.

Let us then, for a moment, consider the other aspect of these duties, and the other responsibility of those who are charged with their performance. The magistracy—the government—the administration, are responsible; the citizen is responsible; society itself is responsible. They are every one responsible to both the others. Every magistrate is responsible to some magistracy above him: every citizen is responsible to every other citizen. All are responsible to the laws of the land—to the public sentiment of the nation—to the judgment of all other nations, and to that of coming ages. The duties are among the highest that belong to this earth—the responsibility for their just performance, the widest and most varied that relates to time. But the immediate question is, when and to what extent can *force* be resorted to, according to the law of God—with regard to these mutual obligations, and this comparatively lower responsibility? The answer may be given, briefly, and in some detail. Whatever *human law* may be executed at all—may, when resisted, be executed, according to the will of God, by whatever force is necessary thereto: it is the duty of the government to have this done: it is the duty of the magistracy to do it: it is the duty of society to take care that it shall be done: it is the duty of every good citizen, each in his proper place and degree, to encourage the doing of it, and when lawfully called thereto, to assist therein. We mean, both that the mutual obligations and responsibilities of all these parties oblige them to act in the manner stated, and that these mutual obligations and responsibilities being moral as well as civil in their nature, God requires their right discharge. If this were not so, the nature of civil society is subverted, the authority of the magistrate is at an end, and the very object of law as a rule of conduct is lost. Law that has no penalty—and gives no

redress, is not law but advice; and penalties that are not, or can not be inflicted,—and redress that is never given—are mere expressions of opinion. The only possible sanction of all laws, against offenses of every description, is punishment; and the only meaning of redress by law, is the application of the force of the commonwealth, to compel the right it had commanded, and to undo or recompense the wrong it had forbidden. It seems to us, therefore, that no clearer duty was ever laid on a human being, than that laid on President Lincoln, to enforce the laws of the United States against the rebellious citizens thereof—and that laid on every good citizen to aid him in so doing. In the nature of the case, there can be but one rational ground of objection to this conclusion; namely, that those rebellious citizens had the right, when driven to extremity, to resort to force—and that they were driven to extremity. We admit that the citizen, when driven to extremity, has the right to resort to force—and will explain that right presently. But we totally deny that these rebellious citizens were driven to extremity; and that they were not, is perfectly clear from their whole conduct. For they had it completely in their power, simply by remaining as they were, to have held for four years, the balance of power in both houses of Congress; and at the end of the four years, to have turned out of power the party which their own obstinate folly, or their preconcerted treason, brought into power—and whose advent to power they call, being driven to extremity. And, further, they not only refused to use any of the regular and ordinary means of security, which must be exhausted before any one can say he is driven to extremity; but they refused to resort—if it should become necessary—to those powerful but unusual means of defense, in the Union and under the constitution, in which, long before they could have been driven to extremity, the mass of the American people would have taken sides with them, in any fair and reasonable claims they might advance. Moreover, no extremity whatever, could justify the ends for which they resorted to force. For we have abundantly proved, that human society, as such, is an ordinance of God, resistance to which he has forbidden and threatened with his high displeasure; and this was the very thing they attempted. Nothing less than the total destruction of our national life would satisfy

them; and their incessant boast is that they have accomplished that at least, whatever else may come.

But we said we would explain the right of the citizen, in extremity, to resort to force. While the ordinances of God with reference to society, government, the magistrate, and the citizen, are universal in their nature and applicability, and would be proper and effectual in their application to the whole family of man, if the whole were united into one social system; they are equally applicable and effective upon whatever smaller number of human beings, and in whatever narrower bounds, God's providence toward our race may indicate. The duties and responsibilities of which we now speak, are, therefore, liable to become, and throughout the earth now actually are, local and special, as well as mutual. It is the American citizen—and no one else—to whom the American nation owes protection and defense, of the kind now intended; and it is to the American nation—and to no other nation—that the American citizen owes the special obedience and allegiance spoken of. These great duties, thus shown to be both mutual and special, are also relative. We have shown how God has made *force* irregularly exerted by the citizen, irrespective of wicked and traitorous magistrates, and even in defiance of them, an ultimate element in the security of society; and how he makes *force* exerted by the magistrate, the regular and ordinary means, of making the functions of society accomplish, through *law*, the objects for which, chiefly, governments exist: and the question which remains is, the right, on the part of the citizen, to use *force* irregularly in his own defense, as before in defense of society. When we say the duties and responsibilities involved are special, mutual, and relative—we have already virtually decided this question. When we examine the Word of God—not only the passage we have printed, but all scripture—we see that the idea continually enforced therein, is that of covenants mutually dependent, stipulations relatively obligatory, upon the magistrate and the citizen. There can be no rational doubt, therefore, it seems to us, that the use of irregular force, by the citizen, when driven to extremity, and to whatever extent that extremity requires, is according to the revealed will of God, and consists with the duties and responsibilities he owes to God, as a member of

human society,—as well as with the lower, mutual, and relative duties and responsibilities he owes to the magistrate and the government. If we deny this great truth, we increase a thousand fold, all the dangers that beset free institutions; and increase, in like degree, the security of all evil and oppressive rulers. If we admit it, we find our conclusion fortified by innumerable statements of God's Word, and multitudes of examples not only of his providence, but of his express commands, recorded therein. If we pass into the wide domain of the history of nations, we shall find no adequate or permanent progress made by mankind, no secure possession of life, liberty, or property, except among armed peoples, who, to a loyal and law-abiding spirit, added a prompt and resolute spirit of self-vindication, which good rulers knew how to respect, and bad ones wisely dreaded. For what end does the magistrate bear the sword, if by his means life is made insecure, property has lost the protection of law, liberty has become impossible, and the most venerable and sacred institutions are abused for purposes at once vile and fatal? Whoever, and whatever, reduces the citizen to such a condition as this, *reduces him to extremity*; and whoever, and whatever, does that, is responsible for all that follows. We do not pretend to say what is the extremity beyond this, which the citizen may, if he sees fit, endure; nor to point out the extremity below this, at which he may, if he sees fit, take up arms. Such questions cover an immense field, and are surrounded with multitudes of conditions. They must be left, under all circumstances, to the responsible discretion of mankind. Under God, there at last, is the great foundation—there the great risk—the great hope of humanity. There, first or last, all terminates, as to this world—whether we will or not. And never, perhaps, did the responsible discretion of a great nation signify more; never was its deliberate and manful exercise more pregnant with immense results, than is true at this moment, with regard to the people of the United States. And never, as it seems to us, was a clearer duty laid on any human being, than that laid on President Lincoln, to prosecute this war, which we have constantly asserted was an unavoidable necessity on his part, in such a spirit of reverence for the constitution, the laws, and the rights of the citizen, as

would enable every loyal man to keep a good conscience, in lending him the most determined support.

If we have succeeded in establishing the fundamental idea on which this Inquiry has been conducted, namely, that God has revealed his will and our duty, concerning every part of the immense subject embraced in it; we have furnished the means of correcting any errors we may have fallen into, at the same time that we have pointed out, to all men, the way, at once simple and infallible, whereby they may reach and enjoy, whatever assurance is attainable by man. And if the great conclusions we have reached, in expounding, on one side the Word of God, and on the other the sins and miseries of the times, find a response in the heart of this mighty nation—not blinded by fanaticism either for or against the four millions of African slaves, who are made the occasion of a double destruction to the nation; the way is still clear and wide before us, in which if we will walk, present triumph, and future security, freedom, and independence, are still attainable. It is impossible to deny, that the change of policy suddenly announced by the President in September 1862, totally changed the character of the war, and the posture of the nation. And it behooves the free states to understand clearly that their destiny will probably be as fatally involved, under this deplorable change, whether the administration succeeds or fails in the new policy, as the destiny of the border slave states, or even that of the rebel states.

ART. II.—*A Commentary on Ecclesiastes, by Moses Stuart, late Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover. Edited and Revised by R. D. C. Robbins, Professor in Middlebury College. Andover: Warren H. Draper. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. New York: John Wiley. Philadelphia: Smith, English and Co., 1862.*

THE man who can expound God's Word learnedly, judiciously, and in a popular manner, infusing the spirit of the inspired writers into the commentary, stands upon high vantage-ground for usefulness. Learned professors in theological

seminaries, have, falling in with their appropriate work, rare opportunities for examining and expounding the Scriptures. Pastors of churches may produce popular, and if they have disciplined minds, learned commentaries. The Presbyterian Church should encourage every honest effort, on the part of her ministry, to write orthodox, wise, and appropriate works expounding the Bible. Her Board of Publication might thus give to the world commentaries in accordance with her Standards, that would not only bless her Sabbath schools, but instruct her elders and ministers.

The Book of Ecclesiastes has been a *crux criticorum*. Yet several commentaries on this Book have appeared of late—some in the German, some in the English language. The German commentaries are unsafe for readers that are not aware of the dangers of Rationalism and Neology.

In the English language, "The Royal Preacher," by Dr. James Hamilton, of London, was issued some years ago. It is not a critical work. It does not profess to be. Nor is it exactly a commentary. It is a cluster of brilliants, eminently fit to encircle the gifted author's head. The main truths of the Book of Ecclesiastes are presented in a style of unusual beauty and attractiveness.

A more recent work, and far better as a commentary, is that by Rev. Charles Bridges, M. A., Rector of Hinton Martell, Dorset. Nor is this work a critical one. It does not even give an analysis of the Book. But it is full of terse and instructive remarks, and it abounds in Gospel truths. For common readers it stands out as a pre-eminently useful commentary.

As unlike these as it is possible to be, is the work of Professor Stuart. It is eminently critical. It displays great learning and research. But for common readers it is absolutely worthless. It is evident that it was not intended for them. The Hebrew scholar will find much in the work to benefit him. But let him beware of the winding paths which so often cross and recross the true road, with every degree of divergence. Professor Stuart was one of New England's representative men. He was a true specimen of those who, in their desire to be original, call in question those doctrines that had been established as the belief of the church for ages.

They fear not the consequences of unsettling old foundations. They laugh to scorn the man who loves the creed of his church, and walks in the path that his father trod before him. The skepticism so prevalent in New England, may be traced in part to the novelties introduced by her religious teachers. Let others be warned by the ensample. The church may become the very bulwark of infidelity. The Roman Catholic idea, that what is a mere opinion of the church in one age may ripen into a dogma in another, would make truth not fixed and eternal, but subject to the mutations of time.

So Bishop Colenso, the Essayists, and others of high standing in the Church of England, would repudiate the Books of Moses as inspired; and blasphemously insinuate that the knowledge of our Lord was limited, because he quoted them as such. This same disposition to strike out new paths, and reject the old, has done immense mischief in our own country.

Professor Stuart was far from infidelity. But he was bold in his speculations; and his familiarity with German theology and criticism gave wings to his adventurous flights. Were Professor Stuart still living, an exposure of his views would be less delicate. Books, however, are public property; and faithfulness to one's own generation requires that their false teachings should be set in their proper light, though their authors are sleeping their last sleep. Professor Stuart's proneness to reject the plain teachings of the Scriptures for novel and untenable views, is frequently seen in his exposition of the Word of God. It is proposed to call the reader's attention to the Professor's arguments to prove that Solomon was not the writer of the Book of Ecclesiastes! God's Word says plainly, that the author of the Book was "the son of David, king in Jerusalem." Solomon was the only person that was both the son of David and king in Jerusalem. Therefore, Solomon *was* the author. We need no higher authority than God's Word to prove that Solomon was the author. Yet, Professor Stuart, following Grotius, De Wette and others, supposes that a later, but unknown writer, has palmed off upon the world a book as though it were written by Solomon. If this can be believed, then it requires but another step to reject the book altogether as an inspired document. The Professor calls the opinion, that Solomon was the author, an "old tradition," and says:

“Of late, scarcely an advocate of the old tradition has appeared.” He adds:

“When we have reviewed the ground occupied by the question, we shall, perhaps, deem it strange if any future critic should engage in such an undertaking.”

In such an undertaking as what? As advocating the old tradition that Solomon was the author of Ecclesiastes! Reader, you had believed God’s Word, that Solomon uttered or wrote the Book of Ecclesiastes. Prepare to have your faith in this testimony overthrown! After the arguments of the very learned Professor, that would be a rash critic that would still adhere to the “old tradition!” His first argument is this:

“(1.) *Many things are said by Coheleth* (the Hebrew term for preacher, by which he continually designates the author, instead of saying Solomon), *which show that Solomon is only occasionally, and not constantly speaking.* He says in i: 12, that he ‘*was king in Jerusalem.*’ The praeterite tense here (הָיָה, *I was*) refers, of course, to a *past* time, and it conveys the idea that when the passage was written he was no longer king. But Solomon was king until his death, and could, therefore, never have said, ‘*I was king, but am not now.*’ Then, again, how passing strange for him, as Solomon, to tell those whom he was addressing that he was *king in Jerusalem!* Could he suppose that they needed to be informed of this? But a writer in times long after Solomon might easily slide into the expression that Coheleth *had been king*,” pp. 86, 87.

Will this argument bear the test? The praeterite tense does not necessarily convey the idea that the writer *had been* king, but *was not now*. The editor of the work, Professor Robbins, in a note, shows that it does not. He says, “A frequent secondary use of the praeter tense of the Hebrew verb is to indicate a state of being which, beginning at some former period, still continues to exist at the time of narration.” Stuart’s own Roediger, as well as Nordheimer’s Grammar, may be cited in confirmation.

Stuart himself, in commenting on chapter iii, verse 15, says: “The first הָיָה here, though in the form of the praeter tense, includes a present sense (as the praeter often does), viz.: *which was and is.*” Again, on vi: 10, he says: “The perfect

הָיָה is here used as an abstract present, including what *was and still is*." Again, vii: 10, "הָיָה, was and still is." Here, then, is Professor Stuart's answer to his own argument, and Solomon, so far from saying he was king in Jerusalem, but is not now, said, "I was and still am king in Jerusalem." Nor was it "passing strange" that Solomon should say to those present, that he was king *in Jerusalem*, even if the auditors knew it. He was showing them what advantages he had for making investigations. He was king in a city of wealth and learning, where he had at command what he desired. So much for this argument. The Professor turns round and confutes it with his own criticisms.

The Professor proceeds:

"In i: 16, he (Cohelah) says: 'I acquired more wisdom than all who were in Jerusalem before me.' Doubtless, being a king, he compares himself with others of the same rank, i. e., with *kings*; and how many of these were in Jerusalem before Solomon? *One only*, viz.: David. Who, then, constitute the *all*? It is only a later writer who would speak thus; and even such a one could so speak only by omitting any special reference to the incongruity seemingly apparent in the declaration as attributed to Solomon. The sentence looks like that of some writer who lived after there had been many kings at Jerusalem. Moreover, in the mouth of Solomon himself, this would wear something of the air of self-magnifying; while a later writer, who admired Solomon, would naturally speak thus of him. In like manner, in ii: 7, 9, he speaks of surpassing, in various respects, 'all who were in Jerusalem before him.' But in the respects there named, only *kings* could well be brought into comparison with him who was a great king; and therefore the same difficulty arises as before," p. 87.

How a man of Professor Stuart's acknowledged learning could so mistake the original Hebrew as to argue from the words "before me" (in English), that Solomon was not the writer because David *only* was before him, is astonishing! The original is, literally, *before my face*. The word translated "before me" in these passages is, לְפָנַי, which means, *in my presence*. It does not mean "before me" in point of time. It has no reference to time. The same word is used in the first commandment—"Thou shalt have no other gods before me." It would be ridiculous to explain this as meaning that we are

to have no other gods before the true God, *in point of time*. It is remarkable that while Professor Stuart makes learned criticisms on almost every Hebrew word in the Book of Ecclesiastes he makes no criticism on 'לפני (lepani). One can hardly avoid the conclusion that he purposely avoided it, lest he should overthrow his own argument, and thus spoil his theory that, not Solomon, but a later writer, was the author of the Book. Professor Stuart *knew* that the original word means *in the presence of*, and not *before, in point of time*.

The Professor thinks, also, that in the mouth of Solomon his reference to his having acquired more wisdom than all that were before him in Jerusalem, wore "the air of self-magnifying." It certainly does not wear so much the air of self-magnifying as does the remark of the Professor, when he says, "When *we* have reviewed the ground occupied by the question, we shall perhaps deem it strange if any future critic should engage in such an undertaking" as to maintain that Solomon was the author of Ecclesiastes! Here, if the Professor does not tell the world that he had more knowledge than all that were *before* him, he certainly judged himself to have more knowledge than all that would come *after* him, unless they agreed with him. Shall we, therefore, argue that the commentary attributed to Professor Stuart was not his?

But the Professor would gladly press into his service, iv: 8, "There is one man and no second; moreover he has no son nor brother; and yet there is no end to all his toil," etc. (Stuart's own translation.)

The Professor says:

"If iv: 8, could be shown to have a particular personal meaning, and that the person in view was the writer of the book himself, it would bring before us a striking incongruity. The case there supposed is one where the individual has neither *son* nor *brother*. Solomon had both," page 87.

What a pity the writer of Ecclesiastes did not say that he was himself the man referred to! Then the conclusion would be inevitable that Solomon was not the author. But the Professor admits that the text probably refers to a *supposed* case; and yet its introduction into the argument shows his wish that

it might be applied to the writer of Ecclesiastes, and thus prove that it was not Solomon.

It requires a fruitful imagination to make iv : 13, 14, refer to Solomon as "an old and foolish king," and to Jeroboam as "a wise and prosperous young man." But the Professor endeavors to make it so, to show that it was not Solomon who wrote thus concerning himself. Good arguments seem to be scarce when such are needed.

But the learned Professor has other arguments under this head. Hear him :

"In viii : 3, an adviser is introduced, who counsels the prudent course of obeying the king in everything. This would not be strange for a king to say ; but when one clause declares that the prudent individual must not hesitate or delay even in respect to a *wicked* command, it would seem very singular to find Solomon thus characterizing his own commands. Then, again, when the writer gives his own view of this matter of unlimited obedience, in verses 5, 6, he says, that such indiscriminate and blind obedience will incur the guilt of sin, and bring the inevitable judgment of God upon him who yields to it ; verses 7, 8. All this is hardly congruous with *kingly* opinion," p. 88.

It is a sufficient reply to say that our English translation says nothing about obeying "*wicked* commands." And if an inspired king can not object to "indiscriminate and blind obedience," because it would not be a "*kingly* opinion," then inspiration is conformed to the whims and freaks of erring men ! Such criticisms are calculated to disparage God's Word. Infidelity rejoices in such views of inspiration. Good but mistaken men, in New England and elsewhere, have, by such teachings, contributed largely to the abounding skepticism. Give us our orthodox standards, and adherence to them, though pronounced servile, rather than that mental independence that makes shipwreck of the faith.

Professor Stuart next refers to v : 7, iii : 16, iv : 1, vii : 7, 10, viii : 9, x : 4-7, 16-19. In these verses various oppressions are mentioned, some of which the writer of Ecclesiastes had witnessed, and in which some rulers are described. He then, most disingenuously asks :

"Can we now, in any way, suppose all these to be the words of *Solomon*, describing himself as a haughty, violent, unjust, tyrannical,

oppressor? Was he a glutton, a drunkard, an idler—he who spake three thousand proverbs, wrote one thousand and five songs, and many treatises of botany, besides managing wisely all the affairs of his kingdom? I. Kings iv : 32, seq. Did he permit the land to be full of oppressive magistrates, who caught at bribes, condemned the righteous, and acquitted the wicked? Was not the power in his own hands to remedy all this? and to do judgment and justice? And yet Coheleth says, iv : 2, 3, that death is preferable to life under the then existing oppression. Yea, in his impatience, he even wishes that he had never been born. And all this when, if Solomon be concerned in the matter, it was at any moment in his power to put a stop to the evils complained of! How is it possible to suppose that Solomon ascribes all this great wickedness and folly to himself? Let any one read the history of his enlightened and peaceful reign, as given in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, and he will see a picture directly the opposite of all this. The matter of *Solomon's authorship*, in respect to such passages, seems quite impossible," p. 89.

It is a sufficient answer to say that Solomon had no reference to himself, his own magistrates, or the kingdom of Israel over which he ruled, in these passages. Solomon's knowledge was not limited to the land of Palestine. He tells us that he "turned and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun," iv : 1. It was of *all these* that he was speaking; and it is mere sophistry to restrict them to Solomon and his magistrates. And it is a mere rhetorical flourish to ask, "How is it possible to suppose that Solomon ascribes all this great wickedness and folly to himself?" It is not possible to suppose it. And none but a prejudiced mind could believe that if Solomon were the writer, he was speaking of his own oppressions. So much for Professor Stuart's argument from the "*things said by Coheleth*." God's truth still stands unshaken—Ecclesiastes is the words of the preacher, the son of David, king in Jerusalem;" i. e., of *Solomon*.

Professor Stuart's next argument is thus stated :

"(2.) *The general state and condition of things, when this book was written, indicates a period very different from that of Solomon's reign,*" page 89.

He then reiterates what he had before stated about the civil

condition of Israel under Solomon, as not corresponding with the oppressions spoken of by the writer, etc.

The Professor then speaks of Ecclesiastes v: 1 (4: 17, of his Hebrew Bible), "Keep thy foot when thou goest into the house of God, and be more ready to hear than to offer the sacrifice of fools." He thinks that there is here something incongruous with the "condition and circumstances of him who had built the temple, and made magnificent preparations for offerings." Indeed! who else could see the incongruity? Nor did Professor Stuart see it at all times. He had said on page 18, "The manner in which he (Cohelah) speaks of frequenting religious worship (iv: 17, v: 1, seq.), shows that he speaks of it in a way which would be familiar to those who frequented the temple-service." But the Professor seems to have a more practiced eye when he wrote page 90! So inconsistent is he with himself, that one is led to believe that it was merely to sustain a theory that he ventured to make this passage an argument.

The only other passage which the Professor adduces under this head, is vii: 26-28, "respecting the extreme *baseness of women*," as he calls it. He says, it "seems hardly consonant with the views of him who had seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines." But a candid reader sees nothing in the passage but what might be expected from one who was in Solomon's position.

Professor Stuart's third and last argument is stated in these words:

"(3.) *Another source of doubt as to the authorship of Solomon, springs from the style and diction of the Book.*"

He adds:

"Whosoever comes from an attentive, critical reading of the Book of Proverbs, written or compiled by Solomon, for the most part, to that of Cohelah, will find himself in a region entirely new. William of Malmesbury is scarcely more diverse from Macaulay, or Chaucer from Pope, than Cohelah is from Proverbs. It is impossible to feel that one is in the hands of the same writer," p. 91.

He endeavors to make this out, in the first place, by showing that "the subjects are diverse." And is this a "new thing

under the sun," that the same author should treat on different subjects? If a man should argue that Dr. Isaac Watts was not the author of the Psalms and Hymns commonly attributed to him, because they treat on a different subject from that of his book on Logic, he would give no great evidence of wisdom. And it might be said that the style of his hymns are as different from the style of his work on Logic, as the style of "William of Malmesbury" is from that of "Macaulay;" and that "it is impossible to feel that one is in the hands of the same writer." Stuart, however, reluctantly admits that "the same writer might change his theme!" Wonderful admission! Solomon, who wrote on Botany, and composed Songs, and made Proverbs, *might* possibly change his theme! Having made this remarkable admission, the Professor adds: "But when we come to the *coloring of the style and diction*, it is impossible to make out anything but the widest diversity" (p. 91). The Professor argues, that there is in the Book of Ecclesiastes "the *later Hebrew and Chaldaism*," while in the Proverbs is found "the *golden Hebrew of the golden age*." Now, as Solomon spoke the contents of this book, in all probability, to the foreign wise men and princes, who gathered to hear his wisdom, is it strange that he should adapt his style somewhat to his auditors? This may account for the Chaldaisms, and other words which are *said* to belong to the later Hebrew. Nothing would be more natural. In I. Kings, iv: 34, it is said: "And there came all people to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all kings of the earth, which had heard of his wisdom." From Chaldea, and Persia, and Phenicia, as well as from Sheba, the rulers may have come; and this very Book of Ecclesiastes may have constituted a part of his instructions to his royal, and otherwise eminent visitors. Why not? And if so, is it strange that his style should be adapted to his auditors? And the words which he used, supposed to belong only to the later Hebrew, may have been words in use in other nations, which were afterward transferred from their languages into the Hebrew.

Professor Stuart argues that "brevity, precision, compactness and energy of expression, predominate" in the Proverbs; while in the Ecclesiastes the style is "here and there expansive and diluted." Let Professor Stuart, or any other man,

prepare a work consisting of Proverbs, and also preach a popular sermon—will not the former be more brief, concise, and compact than the latter? And will not the latter have “repetitious phrases,” that the truths presented may be fastened upon the memories and hearts of the auditors?

Indeed, the Professor himself, in another part of his work (p. 74), accounts for the use of words in Ecclesiastes that are not met with elsewhere. He says:

“New phraseology and new meanings of words, arise from the novel subjects of which the writer is treating, *i. e.*, his *philosophizing* on the vanity of the world. He was at liberty, like all other writers, to choose language adapted to his own purpose. We see in it little indeed of *technicality*; but still we perceive that we are by no means reading the common Hebrew of the other books. But it would be far from candor and fairness, to accuse Coheleth of unacquaintance with good Hebrew usage, because he feels constrained to employ terms and phrases not elsewhere to be found. *Cuique Suum*. It is his right to choose language adapted to the nature of his discussion,” p. 74.

It is refreshing to hear the Professor overthrowing his own argument, against the authorship of Solomon, because Solomon would not use “the later Hebrew,” in which he says the book abounds.

On page 34, he says:

“It is evident from the nature of the book—a book of practical ethical philosophy—that there must be, in some respects, a *diction* peculiar to itself; I mean, that language adapted to *philosophy* must be employed. Hence many words in the book, which are not elsewhere found in the Hebrew. To this account, I can hardly doubt, not a few of the words may be put, which are classed by Knobel and others among the later or the latest Hebrew.”

The Professor’s arguments, however, are most effectually overthrown by himself, on pp. 77–82. He says that Knobel has made extravagant and ungrounded allegations concerning the number of words and phrases belonging to the later Hebrew. He shows that Knobel attaches to “the later Hebrew element” words which can not properly be put there; that words, which Knobel says have “a new sense” attached to them in Ecclesiastes, are found with the same sense in

Proverbs, Joshua, I. Samuel, Ezekiel, Isaiah, Job, and the Psalms.

Professor Stuart says, p. 79 :

"If one will now call to mind how often abstracts are required in a treatise of *philosophy* like the present, he will think it nothing strange, and no special proof of later Hebrew, that such nouns are frequent in Coheleth."

Stuart then adduces eight such abstracts as the only ones that are not found elsewhere, and adds :

"The easy and obvious formation of these for the writer's purpose, renders it difficult for us to establish anything from them in regard to *the age* of such forms. The use of them depended, obviously and merely, on the need of them ; for the form is altogether *normal* and *analogous*."

He says again, on page 81 :

"We have, then, after having examined Knobel's list of the later Hebrew words, only a few remaining. Taking the amount of what is left, we find only some ten or eleven cases, which may fairly be brought within the confines of later Hebrew. And some doubt must even hang over these."

Thus ends in smoke the great argument, that Solomon did not write Ecclesiastes, because of the later Hebrew words and phrases in the book ! It matters not if Stuart's views do coincide with those of Grotius, Eichhorn, Schmidt, De Wette, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Hitzig, and others. The truth is not dependent upon great names. "Thus saith the Lord," is of more authority than all the critics in Germany and America. The arguments of Professor Stuart have been presented fairly, and in their full force. Let the reader judge whether they will stand the test of truth.

The learned Professor treats of the following subjects in his introduction :

1. The General Nature of the Book.
2. Special Design and Method of the Book.
3. Unity of the Book.
4. Diction of the Book.
5. Who was the Author ?
6. Credit and General History of the Book.

7. Ancient Versions of Coheleth.
8. Modern Versions.
9. Commentators.

The Design and Method of the Book is the only point that will be further discussed in this article.

Much learning is displayed by the author, and he presents us rather a new theory. Some minds may be satisfied with his theory. The great mass of readers will feel that the subject is involved in as much perplexity as before. It is not easy to condense his views, spread as they are over fifty pages, into the small space that must here be occupied.

On the general nature of the Book of Ecclesiastes the Professor makes some valuable remarks. He says it is "a work of *practical philosophy*. All the reasonings are built upon the results of experience." He says: "As a specimen of ancient philosophy, the oldest and the only one among the ancient Hebrews which has come down to us, Ecclesiastes would seem to deserve the notice and attention of modern philosophers, and specially of those who undertake to write the *history* of ancient philosophy. Have the Hebrews—the only nation on earth before the Christian era who had enlightened views of God and duty—have they no claim to be heard on the subject of *practical moral philosophy*?"

It would indeed seem as though philosophers of modern times had almost, or altogether ignored, this oldest of all treatises on moral philosophy. Let it demand its place.

Stuart maintains that the first great object of the writer of Ecclesiastes is, "to show the vanity of human efforts and all earthly things in which men seek satisfaction." This idea, he says, is a golden thread running through the whole book. He maintains that i: 2, announces the theme of the author, viz.: "Vanity of vanities," etc.; and that the first four chapters are employed principally to elaborate and illustrate this idea. He teaches that the second part of the book mingles precepts and practical instruction with the representation of facts and occurrences; that with the beginning of the fifth chapter the writer begins to speak *imperatively*, or in the way of exhortation. A variety of subjects is embraced in this second part, comprising also four chapters, to the close of the eighth. Professor Stuart thinks that in this part "divers

objections are presented," as coming from those who find fault with the sentiments of the writer, or from the writer's own mind, "some of which are answered forthwith, and some after intervening matter has been thrown in, which pressed upon his mind." It is in this way that the Professor accounts for the apparently infidel and Epicurean teachings of the Book.

In the third part of the Book, including the ninth and twelfth chapters with those that intervene, the Professor thinks the whole discourse takes a different turn. "The doubts and queries are dismissed." The subject becomes more cheerful, and cheerful enjoyment is commended. A description of old age forms an apposite conclusion, with the return of the spirit to God.

The Professor accounts for the strange sentiments that seem to be taught in various parts of the Book, by supposing them to be the language of an objector, or the language of his own heart in its perplexity suggesting difficulties. This, he thinks, is the only way to account for teachings which seem to be contrary to other teachings found on the sacred pages of inspiration. But Stuart does not suggest any rule by which the reader of Ecclesiastes can ascertain what are the words of the objector and what are the replies of the author. Every one is left to draw his own conclusions. Hence, while one reader may make the sentence, "All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked;" (ix: 2,) the language of an objector; another may make this the sentiment of the inspired penman. Whatever the reader wishes to be true he receives as divine teaching; whatever he wishes untrue, he ascribes to the objector. And whatever a commentator thinks accordant with his system, he adopts as inspired revelation; and whatever he thinks would interfere with his teachings, he sets down to the account of an objector. This would fill the Book with the greatest uncertainty. And, indeed, there is nothing in Ecclesiastes which would suggest objections and answers. There is nothing similar to the writings of Paul, who introduces the words of an objector by the expression, "Thou wilt say then unto me," and follows them by the remark, "Nay, but O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" (Rom. ix: 19, 20). If there were any intimation that an objector is introduced we might thus account for

several passages. There is *no need* of such a supposition. There is no need for placing any part of the Book in the category of an objection, or of supposing it untrue. With a proper view of the teachings of the Book, every part becomes consistent with every other part. There is no conflict, no infidelity, no Epicureanism. All is truth, wholesome, eternal truth.

The following views are suggested to the intelligent reader as the design and teachings of Ecclesiastes:

This Book of Ecclesiastes is a discourse or sermon of Solomon. It is about the length of an ordinary modern sermon. Though a sermon, it is not quite as methodical as some modern sermons, but far more so than many others. Like modern sermons, it commences with a text or theme for discussion. When or where uttered, we are not informed. There are reasons for supposing that it was delivered in the presence of the foreign wise men and princes, who, like the queen of Sheba, came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear his wisdom. "There came of all people to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all kings of the earth, which had heard of his wisdom" (I. Kings, iv: 34). Standing up in the presence of his curious and learned auditors, as Paul did in Athens at a later day, he spoke of God, of his counsels, and of a future judgment. And, indeed, on a careful inspection, this sermon and Paul's address to the Athenians have strong points of resemblance. Both are to us now revealed theology; but they are discourses on natural theology. Paul pointed to the altar erected "to the unknown God." Hence he directs his hearers to God who made the world and giveth life; to God's purposes; and finally to the judgment. So Solomon pointed to nature; to the rising and setting sun, the shifting breeze, the running rivers (i: 5-7). Then he directs the hearers to God's purposes (iii: 14), and to the judgment. "God shall judge the righteous and the wicked" (iii: 17). "For all these things God shall bring thee into judgment" (xi: 9). To argue a future and a judgment seems to be the object of Solomon's sermon. But as his audience were not all familiar with the previously-written Hebrew Scriptures he would not argue from those Scriptures. He would prove another state of existence in a new and original way. He would present his own

original investigations on the subject, as he was inspired to do. And he sets out with the inquiry, *Of what advantage is this life without another?* For this seems to be the true import of the third verse of the first chapter, which is really Solomon's starting point, as will be shown. That verse, which is Solomon's text, reads thus: "What profit hath a man of all his labor which he taketh under the sun?" Labor taken "*under the sun*," is labor for *this* life without regard to a future. And Solomon uses the phrase "under the sun" no less than twenty-eight times in this short treatise, or sermon, by which it is evident that his mind attached an important meaning to it. He contrasts labor taken for this life, and the rewards of this life, with labor taken for the future world and its glorious rewards. Keeping in view that the Book of Ecclesiastes is a treatise on the question, *what profit is there in this life if there is no other?* and that this question is preparatory to the great doctrine of *a future life and a future judgment*, which Solomon eventually declares, we find the difficulties of the Book cleared up. We find a freshness and beauty about it that is truly enchanting. The enigmas and riddles of the Book are all solved; and the treatise stands out prominent—an argument for a God, for immortality, for a future reward. If the great object of the sermon is kept in view all the parts harmonize, and constitute a beautiful and connected whole, and vindicate the government of God from the assaults so often made upon it. What seem to be skeptical teachings present themselves as forcible arguments for a future state. What profit is there in this life if there is no other? If there is no other, "that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath: so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast: for all is vanity. All go unto one place: all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again."

If there is no other life, "All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked." If there is no other life, "Be not righteous overmuch; neither make thyself overwise: why shouldst thou destroy thyself?" Why be a martyr for principle, and receive no reward?

If there is no other life, generation succeeds generation, and

passes away like the rising and setting sun, the shifting breeze, the running rivers. Like these, human life is but a coming and going, or labor without satisfaction, accomplishing nothing worthy of the great Author of life. There is no profit—no new thing to satisfy the soul. From all this a future is inferred. But till the third chapter a future is not distinctly *announced*. In the third and subsequent chapters the judgment is distinctly declared.

But, it may be asked, why consider the third verse and not the second of the first chapter, the text or theme? In reply the following views are presented :

The first and second verses of the first chapter, and the twelfth chapter from the eighth verse to the conclusion, seem to have been inserted by a different person from the writer of the treatise. He was equally inspired, it is true; but there are strong evidences that another person (call him, if you please, the editor of Solomon's work) wrote the first and second verses as an *introduction*, and the last seven verses of the last chapter as a suitable *conclusion* of the Book of Ecclesiastes. It is not uncommon for the sacred books to be supplemented by some one besides the writers of them. Of the books written by Moses, Numbers and Deuteronomy seem to have been thus supplemented. In Numbers xii : 3, we read : "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men that were upon the face of the earth." This verse was evidently not written by Moses; for he would not thus speak of himself. It is put in parenthetically, perhaps by the prophet Samuel. The last chapter of Deuteronomy was added by some other person; for Moses did not write an account of his own death. Joshua probably wrote the Book called by his name. But, if so, he could not have written the last five verses, for they give an account of his death. They were, therefore, inserted by some other inspired person. Some other passages in Joshua seem also to have been inserted by another. (See iv : 9, and xv : 63.)

The first Book of Samuel to the end of the 24th chapter, seems to have been written by the prophet Samuel himself. But the remaining seven chapters, and the second Book, could not have been written by him; for they record events which took place after his death. Indeed, the two Books of Samuel

seem to have been written by the three prophets, Samuel, Nathan, and Gad. (See I. Chron. xxix: 29.)

The Book of Nehemiah was written by Nehemiah; as is evident from his using the first person singular in relating things connected with himself. But in that Book is a passage containing twenty-six verses, which seems to have been inserted by another. Horne says: "The insertion of the greater part of the register in xii: 1-26, may be accounted for by supposing it either to have been added by some subsequent author, or perhaps by the authority of the great synagogue; for it seems to be unconnected with the narrative of Nehemiah, and if genuine, must ascribe to him a degree of longevity which appears scarcely credible."

The Psalms were written by ten different authors; and yet they are called "the Psalms of David," because David was the principal author. The Book of Proverbs is ascribed to Solomon; and the Book starts out with the announcement, "The Proverbs of Solomon, the son of David, king of Israel." And yet the thirtieth chapter is by Agur, the son of Jakeh; and the thirty-first is by King Lemuel. Also the first six verses of the first chapter seem to be by another. The first verse of the Song of Solomon seems also by another, simply stating who the author was.

So the Book of Ecclesiastes is a sermon of Solomon, with a preface and an appendix by another. The following may be assigned as reasons for the opinion:

(1.) Like Nehemiah Solomon uses the first person singular when speaking of himself in this Book. But the verses supposed to be added, speak of him in the third person, calling him "the Preacher."

(2.) The Preacher is complimented as wise, and as teaching the people knowledge, which Solomon would hardly have said of himself in this form.

(3.) It would be perfectly natural for a person, in putting a preface and an appendix to another's sermon, to commence the appendix with the same words with which he left the preface, to show to the reader where his own remarks had been left off and then resumed again. He prefaces with the sentence, "Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher; vanity of vanities; all is vanity." And, then, after laying the sermon

before the reader, he repeats, as calling the reader's attention to what he had said, "Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher; all is vanity."

(4). As another reason for supposing that there is a preface and an appendix by another; there is completeness in the sermon, if we leave out the verses in question; and the conclusion of the sermon is most sublime: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

Thus the first verse is like the title page of a pamphlet, announcing the author. The second verse is a general statement, calling the attention to the contents of the pamphlet. But it does not precisely point out the whole of the great theme discussed. The editor allows Solomon to do this in his own words; which he does in the third verse.

It seemed necessary to make the above somewhat protracted remarks, to show that the third verse, and not the second, is the theme of Solomon, and, therefore, the key to the whole treatise. This having been overlooked by commentators, they have necessarily failed to bring out, in its force and beauty, the connection of the parts of the treatise, and the pertinence of many passages. It is strange that some should argue, as they do, that the key (or text) is found in the middle of the discourse. And yet it has been maintained, that verse fifteen of the seventh chapter is the key. But it is perfectly natural to suppose that an inquiry, placed at the very beginning of Solomon's sermon, should be regarded as containing the essence of the whole, as the text—the key to unlock the hidden treasures of the whole Book. It is all-important, therefore, that we arrive at a correct decision, as to the meaning of Solomon's theme, the third verse of chapter first.

We speak of mere worldly things, and call them *sublunary*; *i. e.*, under the moon. Solomon, on the other hand, calls them *tahath-hashamesh*; *i. e.*, under the sun. It is evident that Solomon meant to restrict his question to the things of *this* world in contradistinction to the things of *another* or *future* life. We must consider him, then, as contrasting the labors for this life with labors for another life. The former he pronounces, by the strong negative implied in the question, *profitless*. This life is incomplete without another. There must, therefore,

be another. He then proceeds immediately to illustrate his theme.

Verse 4. "One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh: but the earth abideth forever." The original is forcible. "Generation passeth, and generation cometh." If there is no future, the coming and going of men, generation after generation, is of little consequence. It is just a stage—a mere drama. It is a farce. There is nothing real. There is no result worthy of the great Author of all things. *Man*, so far from being important, is less important than the *earth* on which he lives so short a time. *He* comes and goes, "but the earth abideth." If man's labor terminates on earthly things, and he perishes when he dies, then the true order is reversed; man is not immortal, while the earth *is* immortal (*i. e.*, so far as reason teaches). The earth is the abiding stage, while human life is a coming on and going off—a mere passing scene, soon to terminate without any important result. "What profit?"

In the next verses, we have a comparison between several natural phenomena in their apparent barrenness of results, and human beings merely coming and going. The Hebrew *vav*, here translated "also," is oft used to make a comparison. We may ask, what good is accomplished by generation after generation coming on the stage of life and passing off again, and being no more; just as we may ask, what good is apparently accomplished by the sun rising and setting in a constant round; and the wind whirling about continually; and the rivers running apparently with the view of filling the sea, but never accomplishing it, and returning again. Nothing seems to be accomplished. The sun of this morning is where it was a century ago—it has made no progress. The wind of this day is as it was last year—what has it brought to pass? The Nile of this year overflowing its banks, is but a repetition of every year's process—it seems to have done nothing. There is a monotonous repetition of the same thing. So is man, as though he were reproduced from generation to generation, to run the same round of pain and folly, and life and death, and joy and grief. *What profit hath life without another life?*

But Solomon is preparing the way, even in this comparison, to show that there is to be a grand and glorious result, in the

far-off future. And he brings it out, especially in the eleventh chapter, by similar figures. The Nile is not a mere waste of waters; but the bread is cast upon it which shall be found after many days (xi: 1). The changing wind brings up the clouds, to scatter their fatness on the furrowed fields (xi: 3). And the sun is not a mere circling orb, to accomplish nothing; but it brings light and joy (xi: 7). And so, the generations of men are not a mere coming and going, with no result. But the soul lives forever. "The dust," it is true, "returns to the dust as it was;" but "the spirit shall return unto God who gave it" (xii: 7).

A careful examination of the whole Book will show that this idea is kept in view, viz.: that this life, with all its labors, is absolutely without value, if there is no future.

The last part of the first chapter is devoted to Solomon's qualifications for investigating the subject. He was a king over an enlightened people (v. 12). He applied himself heartily and earnestly to the search (13). He had been an observer (14). And he had discovered that the evils of this world and its deficiencies, could not be corrected and supplied by human means (15). He had evidence from communion with his own heart, that he had given himself wholly to the investigation; and the investigation itself had yielded only grief and sorrow (16-18).

The second chapter is principally employed in giving Solomon's experience of the worthlessness of this world in itself considered. He had tested it in all its forms of supposed excellence, and found nothing in it. He, therefore, returns to the question, "What hath man of all his labor, and of the vexation of his heart, wherein he hath labored *under the sun*?" for *this* world? He says emphatically that he had found that "there was *no* profit under the sun" (v. 11).

In the third chapter, after showing that in this life ("under the heaven," v. 1), events are all appointed by Providence; and after resuming the inquiry, "what profit hath he that worketh in that wherein he laboreth?" (v. 9), he begins to bring out the great doctrine of a future judgment. Thus he advances, step by step, to announce a future state, which previously he had been inferring from the worthlessness of this life in itself considered; and he declares, also, the

certainly of a judgment. The eleventh verse has great depth and force, and prepares the way for a full avowal of Solomon's belief in a future judgment. It is itself a declaration of a future eternal state, and the bearing of the present upon the future. Dr. James Hamilton gives the following liberal, but just translation: "He hath made everything beautiful in his time, and in the heart of everything he hath set an eternity: so that no man can find out from the beginning to the end any work that God maketh—any process that God conducteth." The word "world" in our translation, is by many able critics translated, "remote time, eternity." God has made everything beautiful in *his* time. The whole, from beginning to end, is his time—eternity is his time. And he hath set an eternity in the heart of everything. He hath given, as it were, even to inanimate things a purpose to fulfill a future destiny. And till that destiny is fulfilled, no man can find out what God designs to accomplish by it. No one can see from the beginning to the end, or the whole plan.

But the sixteenth and seventeenth verses bring out the great doctrine, which Solomon had been inferring and hinting at, in all its force and clearness. He saw "under the sun," in this world, "the place of judgment, that wickedness was there; and the place of righteousness, that iniquity was there." He saw earthly judges partial and unrighteous—wronging the innocent, and clearing the guilty. And God seems to be like them, if we look no further than *this world*. But this leads Solomon to the great utterance of his heart in the seventeenth verse: "I said *in mine heart*, God shall judge the righteous and the wicked."

The great idea is here *fully* brought out, for which he had been preparing the minds of his hearers, viz.: Since there is incompleteness, and crookedness, and sorrow, and apparent injustice under the sun; and man labors in vain if his prospects terminate with this life; there *must* be a future judgment of the righteous and the wicked; there is a future judgment. This future judgment will have its place as well as things *under the sun*—as well as corrupt earthly courts—as well as our birth, death, etc. As there is a time *here*, "under the heaven," v. 1, so there is a time *there*, at the judgment.

Bishop Patrick says, "the last words of this verse may, in

my judgment, be thus most literally translated out of the Hebrew: 'There is time for (judging) every purpose, and every work there.'" But the Bishop supposes the word "*there*" to refer to the corrupt court; whereas it seems to refer to the final judgment. There is a time for (judging) every purpose and every work *there*, at the final judgment. This seems to be the most consistent application of the word.

To condense the teachings of the whole chapter, Solomon begins with the occurrences known to all; and shows how they are in the hand of God. His sovereignty is seen in our birth and death; in killing and healing; breaking down, and building up; sorrow and joy; meeting and parting; getting and losing, etc. He then goes on to show the hand of God guiding "ponderous orbs and mighty incidents" to a far-off goal—to eternity. He brings us to the termination of all earthly events in a righteous award, God justifying himself before the universe. He then returns to the point to be illustrated, viz.: if there is no future, all is valueless—man and beast share the same fate—life is a farce, unworthy of its Author; man, with his noble powers and lofty aspirations, will at the close of this brief life be no better than a brute! And, yet, this is the infidel's proud desire—his boasted wisdom leads no further.

The fourth chapter is an example of unity in variety; containing several distinct subjects, all brought forward to illustrate the great theme, that there is no profit in life without a future state. Oppression, envy, idleness, anxious labor, the life of a miser, of a ruler, and of a subject; all terminate in vanity and sorrow.

The fifth chapter teaches the failure of *formal* religion, of power and of riches, to secure such advantage as the heart desires.

In the sixth chapter there is a continuation of similar themes, and the author sums up, by showing (vs. 10-12) that all those things that might be supposed to yield advantage in this life have already been named—that it is characteristic of man to seek good from them, but that in so doing he contends with God, and is no better off.

Passing over the intervening chapters, in which are many striking illustrations of the main theme, and some repetitions,

the reader's attention is called to the teachings of the last two chapters.

The eleventh is one of the most remarkable chapters in the Bible. It is the focus of the blended rays of the whole Book of Ecclesiastes. It is a clear presentation of a future judgment and reward, in beautiful figures of illustration. In the plainest language, and with most solemn emphasis, it is finally declared, that for all things God will bring us to judgment. To be more particular, the chapter teaches as follows, vs. 1-6: Do present duty, on all occasions, and all your lives, disregarding threatening obstacles, trusting to God to reward you. This is illustrated by casting bread upon the waters—giving portions to many—the clouds and falling timber, sowing and reaping grain, the unborn infant, vs. 7-10. Use God's gifts with reference to rendering an account; and provide against future misery. The whole chapter may be summed up in this brief sentence: *Do and enjoy with reference to a future award!*

In the twelfth chapter, first seven verses, we have the close of the sermon. In one of the most beautiful allegories ever penned, comparing old age to a decaying and unprotected house, we are prepared for the sublime and literal conclusion: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

The remaining verses, by another writer, show his estimate of Solomon and his work; and also show his sentiments concerning what the Book teaches. He sums up all, as the conclusion of the whole matter: "Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty (profit) of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Nowhere, not even in the New Testament, is the judgment more clearly presented. But the circumstances attending the general judgment are reserved for the sublime unfoldings of the New Testament.

ART. III.—*Politics and the Church.*

WE propose in this article to continue the subject commenced in the last No. of the Review (Dec. 1862), under the above title. We then stated that our object was to show what is the true province of the pulpit and what are the true functions of the church, in their relation to the moral, social, and civil interests of society; the special aim being to meet the popular cry raised in certain quarters against the ministry and the church, of "mixing politics and religion," whenever the people from the pulpit or through church courts are exhorted to sustain the United States Government in its efforts to put down the treason and rebellion seeking its overthrow.

It was then distinctly admitted, and we now repeat, that to bring politics, in any just acceptation of the term, either into the pulpit or church courts, for discussion or action, is a clear perversion of the authority which Christ has given to the church. But, on the other hand, we as distinctly assert, that, for the ministry and church courts to enjoin the people under their care to obey "the powers that be," both civil and spiritual, placed over them by divine authority, is but to perform a solemn religious duty imposed by God; and that, consequently, for them to instruct the people upon and warn them against treason, rebellion, and schism, as sins against God and their fellow-men, and to exercise discipline when they are committed, is but a part of the same general duty clearly set forth in the Scriptures; and further, for the ministry and church courts to neglect proper instruction upon either branch of this subject, or to neglect discipline for any of these offenses, and more especially at such a time as the present in our country, when this duty of obedience to rulers is so sadly neglected and these sins are so flagrantly committed by large numbers in every branch of the church, is practically to ignore some of the plainest injunctions of the word of God, and to prove recreant as teachers and governors to the demands of the commission which they hold from the Head of the church. This is the substance of the doctrine sought to be established in the previous article, and it will form the basis of the present. The aim in the manner of presentation is to bring out

only fundamental principles, and to show that the proper treatment of such topics does not invade or involve anything political, but is as essentially religious as expounding the doctrines of grace and urging faith and repentance; it being left to inference, chiefly, to apply the truth thus developed to the great issues now convulsing the nation with civil war.

The main proposition on which the whole discussion proceeds, we here repeat:—That it is within the true province of the pulpit and of church courts, to examine and determine all questions, upon all subjects, in their religious bearings, which affect the moral, social, and civil well-being of society; the Bible being their guide as to topics and the views to be taken of them, and the providence of God in the exercise of a wise discretion determining the occasions on which they shall be presented.

This proposition we proposed to sustain and illustrate, first, from the Scriptures; secondly, from the creeds and confessions of the church of all branches, in its purest portions, in all ages in so far as they speak of the subject at all; thirdly, from frequent deliverances of the church, in past times, upon a variety of special subjects, called forth by particular exigencies; fourthly, from the published writings of men of various branches and periods of the church, who are acknowledged as among its great lights; and fifthly, we challenged that the negative of this proposition could not be sustained by any clear teachings of Scripture, in terms, principle, or by any fair deduction, nor by any evangelical creeds or explicit church action of former times, nor by any prominent names in the ministry.

The former article was confined to the scriptural argument; the present will be devoted to the several remaining points. The argument proper, by which alone such a proposition can be sustained, must rest on the word of God. It is the argument from *revelation*, as the final appeal; for, “let God be true, but every man a liar.” That was concluded in the previous paper. The present will exhibit the argument from *authority*. We claim for it nothing beyond what the expositions of divine truth by wise and godly men, convened in the councils of the church, or preaching the Gospel, or publishing their matured views, may justly demand from the church at

large. Such expositions probably furnish the best illustration of the meaning of God's word on many of the subjects of which they treat, that we have reason to look for at the hands of men. While, therefore, the direct testimony of God in the Scriptures is the sole rule of faith, and that to which alone every one should bow, and while every man must judge for himself of the meaning of the divine word under the illumination of the Spirit, it is of no small importance to know how the church in past times, and under favorable circumstances for ascertaining the truth, may have viewed any given subject. Upon the question now under consideration, if it shall be found that the church has borne uniform and explicit testimony to the doctrine we have attempted to establish, or if it have given only a general confirmation, it will go far to show that our deductions from the Scriptures are correct. The argument from authority, is not, therefore, to be despised. Neither is it to be abused. With a certain class of minds it is always of preponderating influence. With the adherents of the great apostacy it is everything. They are taught to believe as the church believes, and because she so teaches. But we "have not so learned Christ." We may behold the light which the true church casts along the pathway of her wonderful history without being blinded and led astray by it. Let us search for that light and walk therein.

The first point in the plan we have announced (second in order of the whole), relates to the *Creeeds and Confessions* of the church. This is a most valuable species of testimony, and that to which the least exception should be taken by those with whom we are at issue; for it shows the position of various branches of the church at times when her scriptural landmarks were established by learned and pious men, after the utmost pains-taking and prayer to arrive at the true sense of revelation.*

The Westminster Confession, which is substantially the exponent of the faith of so large a portion of the reformed and evangelical churches in this country, and to a considera-

*It is said in the authentic History of the *Westminster Assembly*: "The whole time which they were in session was five years, six months, and twenty-two days; during which time they held one thousand one hundred and sixty-three sessions."

ble extent in Europe, may serve as a sample for the creeds of the reformed churches generally, with this remark—that, as the church in this country is entirely separate from the state, very little is said in this Confession, in the modified form in which it has been adopted by the Presbyterian Churches and others in the United States, upon the points at issue, compared with what may be found in some of those of the churches in Europe. But for the most part they all agree in the ground they take as to the province of the church in things by some, in these latter days, deemed secular and political. We quote from the Confession of the Presbyterian Church in the United States:

“CHAP. 23.—OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.—God, the Supreme Lord and King of all the world, hath ordained civil magistrates to be, under him, over the people, for his own glory and the public good, and to this end hath armed them with the power of the sword, for the defense and encouragement of them that are good, and for the punishment of evil doers. II. It is lawful for Christians to accept and execute the office of a magistrate, when called thereunto; in the managing whereof, as they ought especially to maintain piety, justice, and peace, according to the wholesome laws of each commonwealth, so, for that end, they may lawfully, now under the New Testament, wage war upon just and necessary occasions. III. Civil magistrates may not assume to themselves the administration of the word and sacraments; or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; or in the least interfere in matters of faith. Yet as nursing fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the church of our common Lord, without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest, in such a manner, that all ecclesiastical persons whatever shall enjoy the full, free, and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions, without violence or danger. And, as Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular government and discipline in his church, no law of any commonwealth should interfere with, let, or hinder, the due exercise thereof, among the voluntary members of *any* denomination of Christians, according to their own profession and belief. It is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people, in such an effectual manner as that no person be suffered, either upon pretence of religion or infidelity, to offer any indignity, violence, abuse, or injury to any other person whatsoever; and to take order, that all religious and ecclesiastical assemblies be held without molestation or disturbance. IV. It is the duty of the people to pray for magistrates,

to honor their persons, to pay them tribute and other dues, to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority, for conscience' sake. Infidelity or indifference in religion, doth not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him : from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted."

"CHAP. 20.—OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, AND LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.— * * * II. God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to his word. * * * IV. And because the powers which God hath ordained, and the liberty which Christ hath purchased, are not intended to destroy, but mutually to uphold and preserve, one another ; they who, upon pretence of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God. And for their publishing of such opinions, or maintaining of such practices, as are contrary to the light of nature, or to the known principles of Christianity, whether concerning faith, worship, or conversation ; or to the power of godliness ; or such erroneous opinions or practices, as, either in their own nature, or in the manner of publishing or maintaining them, are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the church ; they may lawfully be called to account, and proceeded against by the censures of the church."—(*See, also, chaps. 21, 24, 25, and 31, of the Confession.*)

It thus appears that this Confession defines some of the most important powers, and assigns limits to the jurisdiction, of civil rulers ; declares what they may do, and what they may not do ; what belongs to their authority, what is their duty, and what would be a violation of each. It also announces wherein, and under what conditions, their behests must be obeyed by the people. All this we should expect in any Confession which pretended to set forth the teachings of Scripture ; and all this we find. But besides these general principles, the framers of this Confession descend to specifications on several subjects, with considerable minuteness, in regard to which they say, it is proper, or the contrary, for civil rulers to legislate ; and in the light of what history shows that the civil powers have often done, and what they are still doing, day by day, the Confession announces what are proper and what improper principles of such legislation ; as, for example, when speaking of the laws which should regulate marriage and divorce ; when declaring that the law of the

Sabbath is "a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages," and naming "the first day of the week" as the time obligatory upon "all men" for its observance, and in specifying what is essential to its proper sanctification and what is a violation of the ordinance; when declaring that civil rulers may not assume "the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, or in the least interfere in matters of faith," which some of them have ever been doing from the beginning till now; when pronouncing explicitly against religious establishments, or the union of church and state; when asserting that the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions are entirely distinct, while certain civil rulers in one direction, and certain ecclesiastics in the opposite, have assumed to combine both jurisdictions in one; and, finally, with much more to the same effect, when telling the civil authorities, with unmistakable plainness, what is their positive, executive duty, toward all classes of their people, touching their strictly civil and social rights and immunities, affecting reputation, person, and property, to wit: "It is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people, in such an effectual manner, as that no person be suffered, either upon pretence of religion or infidelity, to offer any indignity, violence, abuse, or injury, to any other person whatsoever." *

These may serve as a specimen of the subjects on which this Confession speaks authoritatively, in the name of Christ, and upon all of which the civil power has frequently legislated. Now, verily, on what ground is all this so elaborately set forth in one of the most noted Confessions extant, unless the church may rightfully examine into, determine, and declare, in the fear of God and from his word, the duties of all men, in all conditions and stations of life, governments, rulers, and ruled?—unless, indeed, touching all the moral aspects of these subjects, the church is placed by her Divine

* In Robert Shaw's "Exposition of the Confession of Faith," the American editor, in his notes on this section, sustains the view we have taken, that it is to man's strictly secular rights that the Confession here refers when pointing out to the state its duty. "The legitimate design of the latter (civil governments), is to secure to men their social rights, and to defend them in the enjoyment of life and property."

Head *above all other powers on earth*, in the sense that her authority, as derived from Christ the Ruler of all worlds and all people, warrants her, and her fidelity to Him under the demands of her commission, obliged her to speak thus explicitly in the hearing of all mankind, for their guidance and warning? This, in truth, is her express command and mission from God. The fathers of the Westminster Assembly, one of the most learned and pious bodies ever convened, never supposed they were, in these enactments, trenching on ground secular and political. And yet, according to the principles laid down by some in our day, the church, either in her courts or her pulpits, has not a particle of authority to say a word on such subjects; for what, indeed, is it, "after the way which they call heresy," but the most arrogant presumption—running the spiritual plowshare deep into the soil of secularism—for the church thus to lay down, in great principles of ecclesiastical law, to endure for all time and for the instruction of all people, rules for the "civil magistrate," and to tell the state, in terms, to its face, what it may and what it may not do by its legislative and executive authority, even to bound and limit that authority, and to hold up the vengeance of the God of Nations as the penalty for disobedience?

When we claim for the church what is here contended for, and cite this Confession to sustain the claim, we are triumphantly pointed to another chapter of the Confession, already referred to, which says: "Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical: and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth," etc. To this we say, Amen. Matters of purely political economy or policy, as banks, tariffs, railways, the extent of suffrage, partisan politics—questions which involve no essential moral principle, and which all agree are strictly secular—may not be introduced into the pulpit or church courts, for the reason that the Scriptures reveal nothing on these subjects for the church or the world. It is plainly to subjects of this nature that these prohibitory clauses refer. But the matters immediately under consideration, as we have shown (Review, December, 1862), are the very matters which these clauses except; they are strictly and eminently "ecclesiastical," and the word of God speaks with great clearness and

fullness upon them. The framers of the Confession so regarded them, and shaped these standards accordingly, by laying down the law of God on these very topics. The fathers who adopted this Confession as modified for the church in the United States are to be understood in the same way; while they unquestionably meant by these prohibitory clauses, subjects of the nature stated—political and secular, strictly so-called—and nothing more. To put the forced construction upon them contended for by some, would be to make these fathers stultify themselves by destroying completely the explicit teaching of all the other chapters of this same Confession, where the subjects in controversy are dwelt upon as coming within the authority of the church, and on which she is enjoined to make known the divine will.

But if it still be insisted that these clauses cover the subjects in issue, and were intended to shut them out entirely, then we reply that this very section gives full authority to the church to do all we contend for, in the words immediately following the passage quoted: “unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary.” Even, therefore, admitting that the prohibition covers the topics in dispute, it is only a qualified prohibition; for this language states that they may be considered, and specifies the form, manner, and circumstances, under which it may be done. This is undeniable. Our position, therefore, so far from being in the least endangered, is even strengthened, by the only passage in the entire Confession which is brought forward to destroy it, taking the construction claimed by our opponents to be correct. Here they at least ought to be willing to rest. But this is an unwarranted construction. That neither of the prohibitory clauses, nor even this permissive one, refers to the matters in controversy, but all relate to subjects which by universal concession are secular, will be plainly seen when they are read together, giving the entire section, with the punctuation found in the authorized copies of the Confession printed by the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church, viz.: “Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical: and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary; or by way of advice for

satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate." Now, what does this language mean? The last clause refers simply to what is due to the civil magistrate. If he ask "advice for satisfaction of conscience," it would be quite unbecoming in "synods and councils" not to give it, if they were able.* The first clause is equally clear. We have already shown what its prohibitory part can not mean, from other portions of the Confession, where the language covers all the special subjects in debate, and therefore brings them all within the term "ecclesiastical." What the prohibitory part of the first clause and the prohibitory and permissive parts of the middle clause do mean, is also clear. They must refer to matters which all agree are strictly "civil," and to them exclusively. And what is said about them?—that they must not be touched at all by the church? By no means. On the contrary, the very language employed says they *may* be—even they!—and tells how it may be done. It says, in the clearest terms, that "synods and councils" *may* entertain even "civil affairs which concern the commonwealth," in the "way of humble petition in cases extraordinary;" or, to state it in another form, as permission is here given to do a particular thing in a particular way and under particular circumstances, all which are pointed out, the prohibition can not refer to the subject-matter of the thing, but only to a violation of the conditions stated. If this construction be objected to, all we need to say, is, that it is not merely the only one which the language grammatically admits, but the only possible one of which the case itself is susceptible, from its own nature, as here presented. Taking, however, any other construction, if there should be any other which is admissible or even possible—any conceivable one which will preserve the authors of this document from the most direct and positive self-stultification—and still, the Confession sustains the main proposition on which the whole discussion proceeds; and what is not to

* Here is an illustration: "Ministers may be present at Parliaments with the Book of God in their hands, if they be required to answer any doubt; nor ought the Estates make any act concerning religion, or the affairs of the kirk, without the advice and consent of her representative body, the National Assembly."—*Scot's Apologetical Narration of the State and Government of the Kirk of Scotland since the Reformation* (1597).

be overlooked, is the fact that our position is thus fully sustained by the only portion of the entire Confession which is produced for its overthrow.*

Here, then, the case as to this Confession might be permitted to rest. But we are willing to pursue it a little farther for the sake of vindicating our construction, by showing that the framers of the Confession meant in this section precisely what their language imports. We do not wish to leave them under the apparent imputation of saying, for our convenience, one thing while they mean another, nor do we wish to rest under the imputation of misunderstanding either their language or its intent. We desire also to illustrate the correctness of our view by showing that the churches both in this country and in Europe have done the very thing which by this construction is authorized, viz.: "petitioned" the civil "powers that be" in regard to "civil affairs which concern the commonwealth." Taking the two main features of the section, we analyze it thus:

First—In declaring that "synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical," the framers of the Confession undoubtedly had in mind the long and bitter conflicts between the church and the state, and the final domination of the spiritual over the civil power almost universal in Europe for ages previous to the Reformation; and

* A possible objection to the explanation given to this section may be made out of the use of the word "intermeddle." If "synods and councils," it may be asked, "are not to *intermeddle* with civil affairs," does the permission given in the words, "unless by way of humble petition, in cases extraordinary," allow them to "intermeddle," provided they do it under these conditions? Undoubtedly it does. This word does not necessarily mean officious or unwarranted intrusion, though now most commonly so used. Many instances might be given of its use in former times in the sense of rightful interference; and it is no unknown thing that some other important words of this Confession have a meaning in the present popular apprehension different from their original import. One instance, showing a change in the meaning of "intermeddle," will suffice. Bishop Burnet, in his "Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England," in commenting upon Art. XXXVII, "Of Civil Magistrates," where he is defending the right of the Sovereign to the headship of the Church of England, says: "The second is, that kings or queens have an authority over their subjects in matters ecclesiastical. In the Old Testament, the kings of Israel intermeddled in all matters of religion." That they did "intermeddle," the Bishop regards as an argument in his favor. He refers to the fact approvingly, using the word in the sense of just interference.

also the naturally resulting influences prevailing for a long time after the Reformation, and then continuing more or less in every country where the union of church and state remained, and to some extent even among those who had thrown off the trammels of the civil power. With the lessons of history before them, and wishing clearly to bound the jurisdiction of the church within true Scriptural limits, they say that the church may “handle or *conclude* nothing but that which is ecclesiastical.” Of course, “synods and councils” are left to decide in the fear of God, what is “ecclesiastical;” and all within that scope they may consider and *determine*, solely and finally. Let us illustrate. Even the doctrines of the Confession, on many vital points of theology, can not be understood by us without keeping in mind that they took their present verbal form with reference to these two objects: (1.) To exhibit the truth in a didactic manner; and, (2.) To stand as an enduring protest against certain prominent heresies, previously existing, or current at the time. The same principle marks those parts of the Confession which relate to civil and spiritual jurisdiction. The passage just cited was drawn with this double intent. While, as explained by other chapters, the term “ecclesiastical” covers all those subjects which we contend for, as coming within the complete jurisdiction of the church; on the other hand, the prohibition, though stating the truth didactically and directly, is a standing protest against that towering spiritual usurpation (with all its progeny, lineal or collateral, wherever found), which for so many ages meekly placed its foot upon the necks of the sovereigns of Europe.

Second—In saying that “in cases extraordinary,” “synods and councils” may entertain even “civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, by way of humble petition,” the authors of the Confession mean just what they say—“*civil* affairs” strictly so called. There can be no doubt that this is the plain force of the terms. What, then, could the framers have had in mind? (1.) Although the state and the church, as such, have distinct jurisdictions, yet, neither the church in separate denominations or congregations, much less the church as a whole, in any country, whether religion in any form is established or not, is so entirely distinct from the state, as not often to be affected by its legislation, or by the execution of its laws,

in matters strictly civil, and sometimes to its great injury. The state and the church are made up largely of the same persons. In their most vital concerns for this life, the interests of the whole people of any nation are inseparably blended. The acts of the civil power affect all, for weal or woe; and the character of the church, as pure or corrupt, as true to her mission or departing from it, not only affects the body itself, but the outside world, and the civil government and temporal affairs of every nation where the church is planted. Our fathers undoubtedly had in view these inseparable civil and spiritual interests, and the inevitable acting and reacting of the civil and spiritual powers upon each other, when they declared that "synods and councils" might, "in cases extraordinary," in the form of "humble petition," make known their desires to the civil rulers, even upon "*civil* affairs which concern the *commonwealth*"—that is, not merely the state as such, but the *common weal*, or welfare, of the whole body of the people. They were not to "handle or *conclude*" anything of this nature; they could do that, only in matters "ecclesiastical;" but they might "petition," in great emergencies, upon purely "civil affairs." Moreover, it is a fact of no small importance, confirmatory of this interpretation, and showing the meaning of all that part of the Confession we have under consideration, that it was framed by men, of whom some in the Westminster Assembly, both civilians and divines, were connected with church establishments, and all composing the body were from countries where civil and spiritual affairs, as actually administered, were closely interwoven in the conceptions, habits, and daily life, of the whole people. And although this Confession, as we have it in the United States, is somewhat modified to suit our different circumstances, especially in the chapter relating to civil magistrates, still, the section in hand is word for word as originally adopted at Westminster. This may be explained in part by the well-known fact that some of the leading men in the old Synods of New York and Philadelphia, out of which the General Assembly grew, and who at first adopted our standards, were from those countries where the influences we have spoken of had so much to do in forming the habits of thought and expression of even those who are not connected with any

established church, upon all subjects of ecclesiastical law relating to the boundaries between the civil and spiritual jurisdictions. They had sometimes observed, however, in common with the members of the Westminster Assembly, certain matters relating to "civil affairs which concern the commonwealth," and which affected also the church, brought before the spiritual courts; and sometimes these cases were pressed to a dangerous and injurious length. In order, therefore, to avoid these evils, they aimed to narrow down this feature of the law to the lowest proper limits; and hence the original framers, and the fathers in this country following them, restricted the church in all "civil affairs," to "humble petition in cases extraordinary." This we suppose to be a fair view of the circumstances under which this provision of law was framed, and this we suppose to be its true intent. And therefore we repeat, that our fathers did not in this section say one thing and mean another. Neither may any construction be put upon it which shall destroy what they have so fully expressed elsewhere. In this part of the Confession as in all others they weighed their words. They said what they intended, and meant what they said. (2.) Cases have occurred on both sides of the Atlantic which illustrate this to be the meaning of the law, by showing that the church has acted under this provision as now construed. The civil power has often legislated upon matters coming within its jurisdiction—upon "civil affairs" strictly—and yet in a way to be oppressive to the church. Examples of this are found in the Test Oaths, Tithes, Acts of Uniformity, and other exclusive measures, applying to England and Scotland, under which large religious bodies have been disfranchised; and various societies of Dissenters in England, and the Established and other churches in Scotland, have often remonstrated "by way of humble petition, in these cases extraordinary." Contests have thus been engendered between the civil and spiritual powers, which embrace some of the most stirring events of history, than which none are more familiar to the world. So, in our country, has the church taken the same view of this statute, and acted under it. A noted case is that where the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church "petitioned" the Congress of the United States on the subject of Sunday

mails. The Assembly regarded the subject-matter of the case to be a "civil affair," over which Congress had sole jurisdiction. This is evident both from the fact and the matter of her "petition;" and yet, the Assembly remonstrated with Congress against the Sunday mail service, because she regarded it to be her duty to do so as a member of Christ's body whose mission is to instruct all people, of all jurisdictions, rulers and ruled, in the will of God. This case, therefore, comes within and illustrates that section of the Confession we are considering. It is one of those "civil affairs which concern the commonwealth," and yet one which "synods and councils" may act upon "by way of humble petition," and one upon which, under this statute, our General Assembly has acted several times.*

* The Assembly took formal action upon the subject for five consecutive years, from 1812 to 1816, urging upon Congress, among other reasons, the great blessings, in a civil and temporal point of view, which would follow a proper observance of the Sabbath: "That the Sabbath contributes to increase the amount of productive labor, to promote science, civilization, peace, social order, and correct morality; * * * as it restrains mankind from those vices which destroy property, health, reputation, intellect, domestic peace, and national integrity and industry; thus preventing that ignorance and profligacy which tend to reduce the body of the people to poverty and slavery, by throwing the property and power of the nation into the hands of a few;" and that, "in the apprehension of the petitioners, the transportation and opening of the mail on the Sabbath is injurious to the morals and civil welfare of this nation." The Assembly further say: "Works of necessity, such as arise out of extraordinary circumstances, or such as are unavoidable for the support and comfort of life, together with works of charity, are admitted to be lawful, for God delighteth in mercy rather than sacrifice." The Princeton Review, in 1831, at the time when numerous petitions were again presented on this subject, in an elaborate vindication of the petitioners, concedes that the matter of determining the case was strictly "civil," being wholly within the jurisdiction of Congress. The writer is replying to another reviewer who had impugned the motives of the petitioners, and says: "He himself has placed the whole subject on its proper basis. He tells us that Sunday, in this country, is to be respected by the people and government, as a day devoted to rest and worship, except where public or private necessity forbids. And, consequently, the whole question about the mail, is, whether this necessity exists. If this be once made out, there is not a Christian in the land who would utter a syllable of objection. * * * If stopping the mail on Sunday would occasion all the inconvenience which is predicted, they would bear their full share of the burden." As a matter of course, the question of "necessity" and of "inconvenience," upon which the whole case is made to turn, must be finally determined by Congress, that purely "civil" power which alone has jurisdiction of the subject. It is, therefore, in that sense, solely a "civil affair."

We commend the whole matter concerning this section of the Confession to that class of ministers and elders, who have adopted and sworn to abide by it, and yet who are sometimes found in Synods and in the General Assembly, sincerely we do not doubt, quoting it, and perverting it to improper ends. We may endeavor, for example, if we think proper, to induce "synods and councils," even the General Assembly, to "petition" Congress, or the President, to stop the present war and make peace. This would be perfectly legitimate. It would be acting within the statute under consideration. This war is a "civil affair" solely, and one which most intensely "concerns the commonwealth," in the sense of the "weal of the whole body of people in a state;" and also, the "commonwealth" in the sense of "a free state, a popular or representative government, a republic," for its existence in this sense is involved in the issue of the struggle. It is a "civil war," upon the whole matter of the continuance or close of which the "civil power" alone is to consider and determine. It is within its sole jurisdiction. The spiritual power can not determine it. It can not "handle or conclude" war or peace. It is expressly debarred by the statute. And yet, may not the church, if she think fit, "petition" on this subject, when the interests involved concern so deeply all classes of society, and so much cripple her own energies? She is as expressly permitted by the statute in this case as she is debarred in the other. The case is sufficiently "extraordinary," for the world has seen nothing like it before. It is one of the very cases for which such a provision was made. In referring to it, we aim only to expound and illustrate the law fully and fairly.

We now dismiss the Westminster Confession, with the confidence that it fully sustains the position we have taken, as to the province of the pulpit and the functions of church courts upon the matters under consideration; and we find, too, that our position is more than supported by the very section which alone was thought completely to invalidate it.

All the leading Confessions extant in the evangelical world, agree with the Westminster, in ascribing to the spiritual functions and jurisdiction of the church all that we have ventured to claim, except those which place some of the churches which are legalized and established by the state, so completely under

the ban of the civil authority as almost entirely to crush out their spiritual life and render their testimony through their standards or otherwise, nugatory and worthless. We here mention the most prominent of the Confessions of the Evangelical Church Catholic, and give extracts, from which it will be seen that they are all in harmony with our position. Such are the Former and Latter Confessions of Helvetiæ, the Confession of Basle, those of Bohemia, France, Scotland, Belgiæ, Augsburg, Saxony, Wirtemberg, Sueveland, the Church of England, the Church of Ireland, the Westminster, as originally adopted, the Second Book of Discipline of the Kirk of Scotland, and others. These are among the fruits of the Reformation. The earlier Confessions or Creeds were chiefly confined to brief statements of some principal doctrines, in a form to meet particular errors. Such were the Apostles' Creed (so-called); the Athanasian, as commonly termed, though high authority say, "falsely called the Athanasian Creed;" the Nicene Creed, etc. In none of these is found any Article upon the subject under discussion. There was then apparently no call for it. And even during eleven or twelve centuries following, although some twenty or more General Councils were held (the Ecumenical character of some was denied), commencing with that of Nice, A. D. 325, and coming down to that of Pisa, A. D. 1511; although every subject, important and trivial, relating to doctrine and worship, seems to have been discussed and settled in them, from the Trinity down to the errors of the "Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit," so that it would not be amiss to say of several of them as of the Council of Constance, A. D. 381, that "they anathematized all the heresies then known," and passed, too, upon nearly all doctrines; and notwithstanding bitter contests between the civil and ecclesiastical powers raged for many years before the Reformation, and though Louis XII. of France proposed a series of questions to a convocation of his clergy, at Tours, in 1511, to which he received formal replies, touching the civil and spiritual jurisdictions, occasioned by his war with the Pope; still, there was no clear and full setting forth of Scripture doctrine on this subject in any formal Creed or Confession, till the period of the Reformation. But when the church emerged from the long night of the

Dark Ages, during which the lines indicating the true relations of the civil and ecclesiastical powers had been practically blotted out, and their separate functions usurped and commingled, it became quite as necessary for the instruction of the Reformed Churches, and to save them from future perils, that the powers of the civil magistrate, and the boundaries of the civil and spiritual jurisdictions, should be clearly defined, as it was that the special doctrines of grace should be distinctly and formally declared. Hence, we find this a feature, and forming a separate Article, in all the Confessions of that and subsequent times. We give a sample of them, in the order, chronologically, of their adoption. Some dwell upon the subject with much more fullness than others. The historical account of these Confessions, abridged, and the extracts, are for the most part taken from Hall's *Harmony of the Protestant Confessions*, London, 1842:

I. *The Confession of Augsburg.* This was presented to the Emperor Charles V., and published in Latin and German, at Wirtemberg, in the year 1530. "ART. 16.—Concerning civil affairs, they teach, that such civil ordinances as be lawful, are the good works and ordinances of God: as Paul witnesseth, 'The powers that be are ordained of God.' * * * Wherefore Christians must of necessity obey the magistrate's laws that now are, save only where they command and set forth any sin; for in such case they must obey God rather than men."

II. *The Confession of the Four Cities*, or as it is sometimes called, *The Confession of Suerland.* This was presented to the same Emperor, in the same year, in German and Latin, by the ambassadors of the cities of Strasburg, Constance, Meiningen, and Linden. CHAP. 23, OF SECULAR MAGISTRATES.—In former places we have declared that our preachers do place that obedience which is given unto magistrates, among good works of the first degree; and that they teach, that every man ought so much the more diligently to apply himself to the public laws, by how much he is a more sincere Christian, and richer in faith. In the next place, they teach, that to execute the office of a magistrate, is the most sacred function which can happen unto man from God."

III. *The Confession of Basle*, called also *The Confession of Mulhausen.* It was written in 1532, in German, by the ministers of the church of Basle, and subscribed also by the pastors of Strasburg. In 1561, it was again recognized by the ministers of Basle; afterward published by the magistrates of Milan, as the Confession of that church; and subsequently turned into Latin. "ART. 7. OF MAGISTRACY.—Moreover,

God hath assigned to the magistrate, who is His minister, the sword and chief external power, for the defense of the good, and for the revenging and punishment of the evil. Therefore every Christian magistrate (in the number whereof we also desire to be), doth direct all his strength to this; that among those which are committed to his charge, the name of God may be sanctified, his kingdom may be enlarged, and men may live according to his will, with an earnest rooting out of all naughtiness."

IV. *The Former Confession of Helvetia.* This was written about 1536, in behalf of all the churches of Helvetiæ, and sent to the assembly of divines at Wirtemberg, by Bucer and Capito. In 1537, it was propounded to the assembly of Smalcald, by Bucer, "and allowed of that whole assembly, namely, of all the divines and degrees of Protestants," as Luther testifies in his Letters to the Helvetic Churches. It was published in German and Latin. "ART. 26. OF MAGISTRACY.—Seeing that every magistrate is of God, his chief duty (except it please him to exercise a tyranny) consisteth in this: to defend and protect religion from all blasphemy, and, as the prophet teacheth out of the word of the Lord, to put in practice, so much as in him lieth. * * * Secondly, to judge the people according to just and divine laws, to keep judgment and justice, to maintain the public peace, to cherish the commonwealth, and to punish offenders, according to the quality of the fault, in their estate, person, or life; which thing when he doeth, he performeth a service due to God. We know that, though we be free, we ought with true faith holily to submit ourselves to the magistrate, both in our body and in all our faculties, and with endeavor of mind also to perform faithfulness, and the oath which we made to him, so far forth as his government is not evidently repugnant to Him for whose sake we do reverence the magistrate."

V. *The Confession of Saxony.* This was written in Latin in 1551, by Melancthon, for the Saxon Churches. It was subscribed by the Saxon, Meissen, and many other churches, as if to the Confession of Augsburg repeated. As it was drawn up with the express design of being presented to the Council of Trent, it may be well to quote it more at large. "ART. 23. OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.—By the benefit of God, this portion of doctrine also, concerning the authority of the magistrate that beareth the sword, and concerning the authority of laws and judgments, and of the whole civil state, is godlily set forth: and by great travail, and in many writings, the manifold and great furies of the Anabaptists and other fanatical men are refuted. We teach, therefore, that in the whole doctrine of God delivered by the Apostles and Prophets, the order and degrees of the civil states are avouched; and that magistrates, laws, judgments, and the lawful society of mankind, are not by

chance sprung up among men ; and that, although there be many horrible confusions, which grow from the devil, and the madness of men, yet that the lawful government and society of men is ordained of God ; and that whatsoever order is yet left by the exceeding goodness of God, it is preserved for the church's sake. * * * Therefore, in themselves they are things good, to bear the authority of a magistrate, to be a judge, to be a minister of judgments, to use judgments lawfully, to make lawful wars, and to be a soldier in lawful wars, etc. And a Christian man may use these things as he useth meat, drink, medicines, buying and selling. Neither doth he sin that is a magistrate, and dischargeth his vocation, that exerciseth judgments, that goeth to war, that punisheth lawfully those that are condemned, etc. And subjects owe unto the civil magistrate, obedience, as Paul saith : not only because of wrath, that is, for fear of corporal punishment, wherewith the rebellious are rewarded by the magistrate ; but also for conscience' sake, that is, as rebellion is a sin that offendeth God, and withdraweth the conscience from God, Rom. xiii : 5. This doctrine we propound unto the churches, which establisheth lawful authority, and the whole civil state ; and we show the difference of the Gospel and the civil government. God would have all men to be ruled and kept in order by civil government, even those that are not regenerate ; and in this government, the wisdom, justice, and goodness of God toward mankind are most clearly to be seen. His wisdom is declared by order ; which consists in the discerning of virtues and vices, and in the associating of mankind under lawful governments, and by contracts arranged in marvelous wisdom. Then the justice of God appeareth in civil government, in that He will have open sins to be punished by the magistrates. * * * Neither doth the Gospel condemn or overthrow commonwealths or families. And although it belongeth not to those that teach in the church, to give particular laws of politic government, yet the word of God doth generally teach this of the power of the magistrate. *First.* God would * * * by the voice of the magistrate, have sovereign and immutable laws to be propounded, forbidding the worship of idols, blasphemies, perjuries, unjust murders, wandering lusts, breach of wedlock, thefts, and frauds in bargains, in contracts, and in judgments. The *Second* duty. Let the magistrate be an observer of these divine and immutable laws, which are witnesses of God, and chief rules of manners, by punishing all those that transgress the same. For the voice of the law, without punishment and execution, is little available to bridle and restrain men. * * * The *Third* duty of the civil magistrate is to add unto the law natural, some other laws, defining the circumstances of the natural law ; and to keep and maintain the same, by punishing the transgressors : but at no hand to suffer

or defend laws contrary to the law of God or nature ; as it is written, 'Woe be to them that make wicked laws.' For kingdoms are the ordinance of God, wherein the wisdom and justice of God (that is, just laws) ought to rule."

VI. *The Confession of Wirtemberg.* This was drawn up in 1552, in Latin, and presented by the Duke of Wirtemberg and Tecca, through his ambassadors, to the council of Trent. The doctrine of this, on Magistracy, differs little from the foregoing.

VII. *The Confession of France.* This was first presented in French, in 1559, to Francis II, King of France, "in behalf of all the godly of that kingdom." It was presented, in 1561, to Charles IX. In 1566, it was published in Latin by the pastors of the French Churches, "to all other evangelical pastors." Though it is much the same with the preceding, yet as they were confined chiefly to the German Churches, and this concerns one of the principal kingdoms of Western Europe, we insert a few sentences. ART. 39. We believe that God would have the world to be governed by laws, and by civil government, that there may be certain bridles, whereby the immoderate desires of the world may be restrained ; and that therefore He appointed kingdoms, commonwealths, and other kinds of principalities, whether they come by inheritance, or otherwise. * * * Therefore, He hath also delivered the sword into the hands of magistrates ; to wit, that offenses may be repressed, not only those which are committed against the second table, but also against the first. Therefore, because of the Author of this order, we must not only suffer them to rule, whom He hath set over us, but also give unto them all power and reverence, as unto His ambassadors and ministers, assigned of Him to execute a lawful and holy function. * * * Therefore, we affirm that we must obey the laws and statutes, that we must pay tribute, and patiently endure the other burdens ; to conclude, that we must willingly suffer the yoke of subjection, although the magistrates be infidels, so that the sovereign government of God do remain entire, and nothing diminished."

VIII. *The Confession of the Church of England.* This was inserted in the general Apology written by John Jerrell, Bishop of Sarum, in behalf of the English Churches, in 1562, and "agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, and the whole clergy, in the Convocation holden at London, in the year 1562, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing consent touching true religion." "ART. 37. OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATES.—The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions ; unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

* * * We give not to our princes the ministering either of God's word or of sacraments; * * * but that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers."

IX. *The Latter Confession of Helvetiæ.* This was written by the pastors of Zurich, in 1566, and approved and subscribed by the Tigurines, and their confederates of Berne, Schaffhausen, Sangalliæ, Rhetia, Mulhausen, and Bienne, and also by the churches of Geneva, Savoy, Poland, Hungary, and Scotland. "CHAP. 30. OF MAGISTRACY.—The magistracy, of what sort soever it be, is ordained of God himself, for the peace and quietness of mankind; and so, that he ought to have the chiefest place in the world. * * * His chiefest duty is, to procure and maintain peace and public tranquillity. * * * Let him govern the people committed to him of God, with good laws, made according to the word of God. * * * Let him exercise judgment by judging uprightly; let him not accept any man's person, or receive bribes. * * * Let him repress, yea and cut off such as are unjust, whether in deceit or by violence. 'For he hath not received the sword of God in vain.' Therefore, let him draw forth this sword of God against all malefactors, seditious persons, thieves, or murderers, oppressors, blasphemers, perjured persons, and all those whom God hath commanded him to punish or even to execute. * * * But if so be it be necessary to preserve the safety of the people by war, let him do it in the name of God; provided he have first sought peace by all means possible, and can save his subjects no way but by war. * * * For as God will work the safety of his people by the magistrate, whom he hath given to be, as it were, a father of the world; so all subjects are commanded to acknowledge this benefit of God in the magistrate. * * * Finally, let them pay all customs and tributes, and all other duties of the like sort, faithfully and willingly. And if the common safety of the country and justice require it, and the magistrate do of necessity make war, let them even lay down their life and spend their blood for the common safety and defense of the magistrate; and that in the name of God, willingly, valiantly, and cheerfully. For he that opposeth himself against the magistrate, doth procure the wrath of God against him. We condemn, therefore, all contemners of magistrates, rebels, enemies of the commonwealth, seditious villains and, in a word, all such as do either openly or closely refuse to perform those duties which they owe."

X. *The Confession of Belgiæ.* This was published in French, in the name of all the churches of Belgiæ, in 1566; and in 1579, in the public Synod of Belgium, was repeated, confirmed, and twined into the Belgian

tongue. ART. 36.—We believe that the most gracious and mighty God did appoint kings, princes, and magistrates, because of the corruption and depravation of mankind; and that it is his will that this world should be governed by laws, and by a certain civil government, for punishing the faults of men, and that all things may be done in good order among men. Therefore, he hath armed the magistrates with the sword, that they may punish the wicked and defend the good. * * * Moreover, all men, of what dignity, condition, or state soever they be, ought to be subject to their lawful magistrates, and pay unto them subsidies and tributes, and obey them in all things which are not repugnant to the word of God."

XI. *The Confession of Bohemia*, sometimes called *The Confession of the Waldenses*. It was published in 1573, in many places, and approved by the University of Wirtemberg. A former one, substantially corresponding with this, was published as early as 1532, and approved by Luther and Melancthon. "CHAP. 16. OF THE CIVIL POWER, OR CIVIL MAGISTRATE.—Furthermore, it is taught out of holy Scripture, that the civil magistrate is the ordinance of God, and appointed by God; * * * and is maintained to govern the people in those things which appertain to the life of this body here upon earth. * * * And that in regard to their duty they are especially bound hereunto, and that this is their peculiar charge, that they cherish among the people, without respect of persons, justice, peace, and all good things that appertain unto the time; that they protect and defend their peaceable subjects, their rights, their goods, their life, and their bodies, against those that wrong and oppress them, or do any ways indamage or hurt them; also, that against the unjust violence of the Turks, together with others that do the like, they do succor and defend them; and so serve the Lord God herein, that they bear not the sword in vain, but valiantly, courageously, and faithfully, use the same to execute the will and works of God therewith. * * * Moreover, the people also are taught concerning their duty, and by the word of God are effectually thereunto enforced; that all and every of them, in all things (so that they be not contrary unto God), perform their obedience to the superior power."

XII. *The Confession of Scotland*. This was first presented to and allowed by the three estates in Parliament, at Edinburg, in 1560; again ratified at the same place, and on the same authority, in 1567; and finally subscribed by the King and his household, at Holyrood House, January 28, 1581. It is generally supposed to be the production chiefly of John Knox. "ART. 24. OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.—We confess and acknowledge empires, kingdoms, dominions, and cities, to be distincted or ordained by God; the powers and authority in the same, be it of emperors in their empires, of kings in their realms, dukes and

princes in their dominions, and of other magistrates in their cities, to be God's holy ordinance. * * * We farther confess and acknowledge, that such persons as are placed in authority, are to be beloved, honored, feared, and holden in most reverend estimation. * * * And therefore, we confess and avow, that such as resist the supreme power doing that thing which appertaineth to his charge, do resist God's ordinance, and therefore can not be guiltless. And farther we affirm, that whosoever deny unto them their aid, counsel, and comfort, whilst the princes and rulers vigilantly travail in execution of their office, the same men deny their help, support and counsel to God, who, by the presence of his lieutenant, doth crave it of them." .

XIII. *The Confession of the Church in Ireland*, "agreed upon by the Archbishop and Bishops, and the rest of the clergy of Ireland, in the Convocation holden at Dublin, in 1615," etc. Art. II. Of the Civil Magistrate, is almost verbally that of the 37th Article of the Church of England, adopted in 1562.

XIV. *The Synod of Dort*, which was in session in 1618-19, adopted articles on five principal doctrines, not embracing, however, the subject of Civil Magistracy.

XV. *The Confession of the Westminster Assembly*; "agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, with the assistance of the Commissioners from the Church of Scotland, as a part of the Covenanted Uniformity in Religion betwixt the Churches of Christ in the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland; examined and approved by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, anno 1647, and ratified and established by Act of Parliament, anno 1649." The only difference between this Confession as modified and adopted by the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and as originally adopted at Westminster, on the subject of magistracy (in so far as previously quoted), is in the following section from the earlier form: "CHAP. 23. OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.— * * * 3. The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; yet he hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the church; that the truth of God be kept pure and entire; that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. For the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call Synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God."

XVI. *The Second Book of Discipline*: or Heads and Conclusions of the Policy of the Kirk of Scotland:—"Agreed upon in the General

Assembly. 1578; inserted in the registers of Assembly, 1581; sworn to in the National Covenant, revived and ratified by the Assembly, 1638; and by many other acts of Assembly; and according to which the Church Government is established by law, anno 1592 and 1690." This account and the extracts here given are taken from the "Pardovan Collections." The only change made is in the orthography. "CHAP. 1. * * * The civil power is called the power of the sword, and the other the power of the keys. The civil power should command the spiritual to exercise and do their office according to the word of God; the spiritual rulers should require the Christian magistrate to minister justice and punish vice, and to maintain the liberty and quietness of the kirk within their bounds. The magistrate commandeth external things for external peace and quietness among the subjects; the minister handleth external things only for conscience' cause. * * * The ministers exercise not the civil jurisdiction, but teach the magistrate how it should be exercised according to the word." This Second Book of Discipline contains much more that is valuable to our purpose, but want of space forbids further extracts."*

An apology may seem to be due for this extended quotation of Confessions upon a single point; but we wished to exhibit the testimony of the whole Protestant world upon the subject

* *The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, hold this doctrine: ART. 37. OF THE POWER OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATES.*—The power of the civil magistrate extendeth to all men, as well clergy as laity, in all things temporal; but hath no authority in things purely spiritual. And we hold it to be the duty of all men who are professors of the Gospel, to pay respectful obedience to the civil authority, regularly and legitimately constituted." In the *Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, is found: ART. 23. OF THE RULERS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.—The President, the Congress, the General Assemblies, the Governors, and the Councils of State, *as the delegates of the people*, are the Rulers of the United States of America, according to the division of power made to them by the Constitution of the United States, and by the Constitutions of their respective States. And the said States are a sovereign and independent nation, and ought not to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction." In a note to this Article, in the *Discipline*, it is said: "As far as it respects civil affairs, we believe it the duty of Christians, and especially of all Christian ministers, to be subject to the supreme authority of the country where they may reside, and to use all laudable means to enjoin obedience to the powers that be; and therefore, it is expected that all our preachers and people, who may be under the British, or any other government, will behave themselves as peaceable and orderly subjects." We need not quote from other church Confessions in the United States. The doctrines held by all of them, on the subject of Civil Magistracy, and the duty of obedience thereto, are substantially the same as those here given, and those of the Evangelical Churches of all countries.

in hand. No better testimony to the sentiments of the church at large upon any point of scriptural doctrine can be found than exists in her elaborated Confessions. The only comment needed is to call attention to the specific points here made. These various denominations of the Church Catholic, spread over the whole Christian world, claim it to be within their province, and of their express authority and duty, from the word of God, as enjoined by their common Head, the Lord Jesus Christ,—1. To set forth the province, authority and duty of civil rulers, both positively and negatively, showing the derivation, nature, grounds, obligations, and limits, of their functions and power; 2. To enjoin upon the people obedience to civil rulers, and show the nature, grounds, and conditions, of that obedience; 3. Although these formulas differ somewhat upon the province of civil rulers, and as to the precise line of demarkation between the civil and spiritual functions, yet they all agree in these two points—all that are essential to our argument—(1.) That the church may and should declare, from God's word, what the functions of civil rulers, as such, are; and (2.) That God has thus placed, in this sense, the spiritual above the civil power; the whole showing, 4. That these various denominations of the Evangelical Church Catholic, in thus expounding the word of God, do not deem that they are interfering in matters political and forbidden to them, but are only discharging a high spiritual duty which is of the very essence of their commission, and whose fulfillment is of the highest importance to the temporal and spiritual welfare of the church and of all mankind. The only inference we draw from all this, is the very obvious one, that those subjects, which the whole Christian world, through their Confessions, thus declare to belong to the province of the church—provided these formulas are correct in their expositions of this portion of divine truth—the pulpit and church courts everywhere, may and should entertain, according to the leadings of God's providence and the emergencies of the case. And here we leave the Confessions.

We come now to another important part of the argument from authority, illustrating the proposition which we have aimed to establish. This may be called the testimony from the *Acts and Deliverances of the Church*. It would be quite strange,

after the full elaboration given to the general subject in hand, in the Creeds and Confessions of the church at large, if we did not find some illustration of the doctrine therein set forth, in the action of the church, through her judicatories. We do, however, find testimony of this character, on a variety of special subjects, marking her whole history, in all parts of the world. The chief obstacle we encounter is, that these illustrations are so abundant, that we find it difficult to make a selection. Volumes are filled with them. In the midst of this mass of testimony, it is quite likely that we may omit some cases that would illustrate our subject more strikingly than some of those we shall present.

In regard to this testimony it should be understood, that we do not assume that the church gave a proper deliverance, as to its special subject-matter, in any case to be cited. That point has nothing to do with the present issue. It is not essential to our argument. Whether right or wrong in the matter of any deliverance, the simple fact that the testimony was given shows the authority which the church claimed in the premises ; and that she claimed and exercised the authority to speak at all on the subjects considered, is the point which sustains our position. Nor should any unjust suspicion be thrown upon the subject-matter of these deliverances. The fact, however, that the honored fathers of the church made them, shows that they judged they had the right, and that under the circumstances it was their duty, to speak as they did ; and upon this simple point—what the word of God demanded of them as ministers, and what lies within the true province of the church,—they were probably quite as well informed as some of their children. With these suggestions in mind, let us look at a few cases of their testimony as samples of many. We may take the Presbyterian Church in the United States as illustrating the position of other ecclesiastical bodies in our country ; sometimes, indeed, unfortunately for them, in the way of contrast.

In 1756, before the formation of the General Assembly, the Synod of New York, out of which in part the Assembly was formed, put forth a Pastoral Letter upon the French War, in which the Synod take decided ground, and urge the people to pray for and sustain “their rightful and gracious sovereign, King George II. his royal family, all officers civil and military,”

against the French, whom they denominate “a potent, prevailing, and cruel enemy.” This is quite explicit. They exhort the people to sustain the government in prosecuting the war against their public enemies, and did not deem, that in doing so, they were going beyond the proper functions of the church.

Just ten years later, in 1766, the Synod sent out a congratulatory letter to the churches, upon the repeal of the Stamp Act, in which they exhort the people to manifest their joy “by a cheerful and ready obedience to civil authority.” And they further say: “We most earnestly recommend it to you, *to encourage and strengthen the hands of government*, to demonstrate on every proper occasion your undissembled love for your mother country, and your attachment to her true interest, so inseparably connected with our own.”

In 1775, the same body issued a Pastoral Letter upon the Revolutionary War. They first exhort the people to express “attachment and respect to our sovereign, King George, and to the revolution principles by which his august family was seated on the British throne”—thus indorsing a revolution in the government of England, by which the house of Stuart was overthrown and the house of Hanover elevated to power. Then they urge the people to sustain the revolution progressing in this country, in this language: “Be careful to *maintain the Union* which at present subsists through all the colonies; nothing can be more manifest than that the success of every measure depends upon its being inviolably preserved; and therefore, *we hope that you will leave nothing undone which can promote that end.*” In particular, as the Continental Congress, now sitting in Philadelphia, consists of delegates chosen in the most free and unbiased manner, by the body of the people, let them not only be treated with respect, and encouraged in their difficult work—not only let your prayers be offered up to God for his direction in their proceedings—but adhere firmly to their resolutions; and let it be seen that they are able to bring out the whole strength of this vast country to carry them into execution.”

If those eminent fathers of the church, convened in the council of her highest court—Witherspoon (who afterward signed the Declaration of Independence), and Rodgers, and Caldwell, and Halsey, and Ogden, and others—could thus exhort

the people to sustain the Congress sitting in Philadelphia, in the great struggle which resulted in *establishing* the United States Government, and making us a nation among the nations of the earth; shall it be deemed, in our day, secular and political, and a profane prostitution of church authority, for the courts of the church to exhort men to stand by the administration sitting in Washington, in the far greater struggle now made to *preserve and perpetuate* this same government and nationality, not against a foreign foe, but against a godless and causeless rebellion? *

In 1789, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church unanimously adopted an Address congratulating Gen. Washington on his election to the Presidency of the United States; and this address called forth from the great captain and statesman a reply which does honor to him as a man, a patriot, and a Christian. We give barely two sentences from this address, made "To the President of the United States:" "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America embrace the earliest opportunity in their power, to testify the lively and unfeigned pleasure which they with the rest of their fellow citizens feel, on your appointment to the first office in the nation. * * * We shall consider ourselves as doing an acceptable service to God, *in our profession*,

* But is this, indeed, a "rebellion," which is now raging against the National Government? Some are afraid of using the word, and deem it harsh to apply the term "rebels" to "our Southern brethren." And some go so far as to draw a parallel between them and our fathers of the Revolution of 1776. Men of the South have done this from the first. Let us appeal to history and to high authority. Robert Treat Paine, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, says of Dr. Jonathan Mayhew, who preached in Boston and published a sermon on Civil Government, some years before the Revolutionary War, that he was "The Father of Civil and Religious Liberty in Massachusetts and America." John Adams is called one of Dr. Mayhew's political disciples; and from the instructions of the master, the scholar said, in 1775, in defense of resistance to the despotism of the British Government: "We are not exciting rebellion. Opposition, nay, open, avowed resistance by arms, against usurpation and lawless violence, is not rebellion by the law of God or the land. *Resistance to lawful authority makes rebellion.* Hampden, Russell, Sydney, Somers, Holt, Tillotson, Burnet, Hoadley, &c., were no tyrants nor rebels, although some of them were in arms, and the others undoubtedly excited resistance against the tories." This is the point. The men of '76 were not "rebels." The present opposition in the South is "to lawful authority," in a free, elective government. That "makes rebellion"—deep-dyed and unpardonable.

when we contribute to render men sober, honest, and industrious citizens, and the *obedient subjects of a lawful government*."

The action of the General Assembly is very explicit on many subjects of state legislation: as, for example, in petitioning Congress against governmental desecration of the Sabbath in carrying the mails on that day; in adopting some five or six papers, more or less elaborate, on slavery, running through a period of more than seventy years;* in passing resolutions, on many occasions, in favor of African colonization; in indorsing organizations for the promotion of temperance; in taking action upon theaters, and upon lotteries, "condemning the practice of gambling by lottery, under the sanction of legislative patronage;" and acting on a variety of other kindred subjects; in all of which the church condemns or approves these secular matters, according to their moral and religious bearings, though countenanced, or established, by direct action of the civil authority.

These things, thus fully interwoven with the whole history

*Prof. David Christy, of Cincinnati, has published, within the past year, an octavo of more than six hundred pages, entitled "Pulpit Politics; or Ecclesiastical Legislation on Slavery, in its disturbing influences on the American Union." He has done the public some service in collecting a mass of statistics and authorities, which may be of use in many ways; but the argument of the book, as a whole, is a total failure. His premises are false, his reasoning erroneous, and his conclusion what might be expected. He assumes that the church has no business to take any action on Slavery; that to do so is to meddle with "politics;" and he calls it "ecclesiastical legislation in civil affairs." These are his premises, and from these he reaches a foregone conclusion. But his admissions overturn his premises, reasoning, and all. He admits, or rather insists, that Slavery is found in the Scriptures; that the duties of master and servant are defined therein; that the relation is sanctioned of God; in a word, that Slavery is a divine institution. This is quite enough. If all this be so, then the subject is at once removed from the exclusive domain of the secular and political into the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical, for the latter covers all that is contained in the Scriptures. If it be once granted that the subject is found in the word of God, and that his will upon it is there made known, it must follow that the church is authorized and bound to express that will. This is the view which our church has taken, and upon this ground it has many times spoken. If the church acts erroneously on this subject, it is to be lamented, just as though she should erroneously expound a doctrine of salvation. But if the subject be in the word of God, in any shape, the church may act upon it. Prof. Christy's logic, that, because the church has acted wrong or fanatically, and the result has been strife, schism, and rebellion—even admitting all this to be so—*ergo*, the church should not have touched the subject at all, is entirely unworthy of being dignified with the name of reasoning.

of the Presbyterian Church in this country—and similar action has been taken by other ecclesiastical bodies—have given the church a character before the world, and fixed the status of the church upon the proposition we have laid down.

So far as our reading extends, while there was some difference of opinion as to what action should be taken in some of these cases, and as to the expediency of taking any action at all, no man in this high court is known to have contended, until within a very few years past, that action upon such subjects was without the true province of the church, an assumption of unwarranted authority on her part, and a perversion of her functions. Certain it is, that no action was ever taken by the General Assembly sustaining this view. Such ground, however, was openly taken in the General Assembly of 1859, at Indianapolis, by some leading men from the extreme South, in the debate on the proposal to recommend the American Colonization Society; and the doctrine then announced, that the church has no authority to act upon such matters, was regarded as a new doctrine in the church. It was pronounced, in terms, “a new doctrine,” and “novel to the rising generation of Christians,” in the Quarterly Reviews emanating from Princeton and Columbia, in their notice of the debates in that Assembly, the former condemning and the latter approving the doctrine.* And the remotest period to which an able

* Dr. Hodge in the Princeton Review, says: “These remarks are made with the obvious purpose to prevent the hasty assumption that the General Assembly gave its sanction to *the new and startling doctrine on the church*, which Dr. Thornwell so eloquently advocated. * * * We pray God that this poison may be dashed away, before it has reduced the church to a state of inanition, and delivered her bound hand and foot into the power of the world. * * * It is only on the assumption that Presbyterians, neither in this country nor in Europe, have ever understood their own system, that the principle advocated by Dr. Thornwell can be admitted.” On the same subject, an anonymous writer in the Southern Presbyterian Review, says: “The eloquent debater (Dr. Thornwell) embraced the only opportunities that were given to announce a doctrine, not new, indeed, but most important, and *comparatively novel to the rising generation of Christians*.” And even Dr. Palmer, while defending the doctrine in this Review, substantially concedes its novelty, thus: “It was something, however, to have had those principles so clearly enunciated in the hearing of the whole church; and we may rest assured the end is not yet. Attention being so publicly called to the question—what is the true nature and province of the church of Christ—it must continue to be agitated until a final and satisfactory response is given in some formal and authoritative utterance, so soon as the church shall be prepared to render it.”

writer in the latter periodical refers, in the history of our church, to relieve the doctrine of entire novelty as to any church action, is to the Assembly of 1848. But so far from sustaining the position that the church may not act upon these questions, that very Assembly, in the very case referred to, affirms that the church has full authority so to act. The minute was made, in an elaborate report to the Assembly, upon a proposal to recommend the American Temperance Union, wherein the Assembly explicitly sanction the principle we contend for, in speaking of Colonization, Temperance, and other similar institutions, in these plain words :

“When they proclaim principles that are scriptural and sound, it is not denied that *the church has a right*, and under certain circumstances *may be bound, to bear testimony in their favor* ; and when, on the other hand, they inculcate doctrines which are infidel, heretical, and dangerous, *the church has a right to condemn them.*”

This is as direct and unequivocal a testimony to the point under consideration, as could be put into human language ; and when it is taken in connection with the action of the Assembly a few years before, wherein the Assembly say, “that they cordially approve and rejoice in the formation of temperance societies ; * * * that they earnestly recommend, as far as practicable, the forming of temperance societies in the congregations under their care ; * * * and that, as friends of the cause of temperance, this Assembly rejoice to lend the force of their example to the cause, *as an ecclesiastical body* ;” whatever may be thought of the “cause” itself here commended, or the expediency of commending it, it is plain that all this action sustains most fully the proposition we have laid down ; while it fixes the birth of this child of the imagination, so far as its name appears before any high court of record—and then only in an eloquent declamation—at the General Assembly of 1859. The bantling is thus not four years old ; and it has never been circumcised, or had ecclesiastical baptism. Its recent origin, its notorious paternity, its bold avowal, are all well remembered ; and though to some men the *animus* which was thought to prompt the movement was then impenetrable, the terrible events which have so speedily followed, in the state and the church, largely through the early

lead and co-operation of these same men, have lifted the veil from before all eyes but those of the willfully blind.

Now, it matters not whether this testimony from the deliverances of the church be deemed of the least possible value, or otherwise. The argument is not rested upon it. That stands upon the immovable ground of Scripture. This testimony is cited merely as an illustration of the views of the church. As such it had a certain value—small, in the comparison, it may be; infinitely less than nothing, if it conflict with the word of God—but yet, it is an unbroken testimony of its kind, beginning with the origin of our church in this country, and coming down, without a single flaw in any link of the chain, to the action of the last General Assembly of the year of grace, 1862; and generally, these deliverances have been enacted with great and frequently with entire unanimity.

We may follow this testimony of the church in this country, with that of a similar character from the action of church courts in Great Britain and among the churches of Continental Europe. The Scotch Churches, both Established and Free, with all the smaller branches of the Presbyterian family in Scotland, and the English Dissenting Churches, abound in illustrations of it. The principle runs through all the strata of their perilous and thrilling history, and crops out into frequent action of their highest courts, in all their conflicts with the usurpations of a corrupt hierarchy and the encroachments of the civil power. Every reader especially of Scottish history is familiar with it. Scotland's novelists have told its story in their entrancing fiction, and Scottish bards have embalmed it in song. It is too well known to be in any manner of doubt; and yet it may be well to give a few examples. We take them all from the Scotch Church, especially because that church in its polity more nearly resembles the Presbyterian Churches in the United States. They are chiefly from Calderwood's History of the Kirk of Scotland, and other publications of the Wadrow Society, Edinburgh edition. The only change made in the quotations is that the orthography is modernized.

The Reformation having been settled on a substantial basis, and the Confession of Faith for the Scotch church, drawn up mainly by Knox, having been "read in the face of Parliament,

and ratified by the three Estates of Edinburgh, the 17th day of July, 1560," the first General Assembly of the "Reformed Kirk of Scotland," was held at Edinburgh on the 20th day of December of the same year. The Assembly met twice in each year, commencing with 1561, down to 1567. In the last named year it met three times. In 1568 it convened once, but was prevented from meeting a second time, "in respect of the stormie weather, and the brute of the plague." In 1569 it held two meetings, and in 1570 it held two. We pass by all these meetings of the highest judicatory of that church but the last, in the records of each of which is found matter for the illustration of our subject.

At the twenty-first General Assembly, held at Edinburgh, on the 5th of July, 1570, among the "Acts" passed was the following :

"5. *It was ordained*, That as it pleased God of his mercy to erect the authority of the King's Majesty, with public consent of the Estates, even so the same ought and should be universally obeyed throughout this realm, without acknowledging any other authority, whatsoever title be pretended. Moreover, that ministers, after their public sermons, pray publicly for the preservation of his Majesty's person and authority; with certification that all such as shall be found negligent or disobedient shall be punished, as the Assembly shall think expedient. Further, it was declared, that if any subject or subjects of this realm, of what Estate soever they be, shall take upon them presumptuously to inhibit any minister to obey the ordinance of the General Assembly, what cloak or color soever he or they pretend, or by menacing make impediment unto them, so that ministers may not without fear serve God in their vocation, that in that case such troublers shall be summarily, upon the notoriety of the fact, excommunicated, and shall be holden rotten members, unworthy of the society of Christ's body. And, last, the Assembly commendeth all superintendents and commissioners of provinces, to cause this determination to be published in all the parish kirks, that none hereafter pretend ignorance. *It was ordained*, That this act should be printed by Robert Leckprevick, that it might come to the knowledge of all men. The superintendent of Lothian's letter, agreeth best with this time. *Item.—It was statute and ordained*, By reason of the great trouble lately raised by defection of some from the King's Majesty's lawful authority, that certain brethren be sent from the Assembly to all earls, lords, barons, and other gentlemen, that have made defection, as said is, to draw them by all means possible to the

lawful obedience of his Majesty; and to certify them that disobey, the Assembly will use the sword against them, which God hath committed unto them." *— *Culderwood, Vol. III., p. 3.*

Let it be here observed, that the Assembly enjoin, in this Ordinance, as a religious duty of ministers and people, (1), Obedience to the lawfully established supreme civil authority; (2), That all ministers "pray publicly" in their churches for the preservation of this authority; (3), That those who neglect these duties should be punished; (4), That all "troublers" of the ministry in the execution of these duties, should be excommunicated; (5), The Assembly send a committee to those who are guilty of "defection" from obedience to the civil authority, to exhort them to return to their duty, and to warn "them that disobey" the Assembly's mandate, that they will excommunicate them; (6), And, finally, that this ordinance should be read in every church of the realm.

If such a Scriptural statute were put in force in the United States to-day—nearly three hundred years further along, though we boast of being in the march of civilization and religion—what large numbers who now preach the Gospel would instantly lose their commissions! and how many others would be excommunicated from the church!

The twenty-seventh General Assembly convened at Edinburgh, on the 6th day of August, 1573. "Alexander, Bishop of Galloway, was summoned by Mr. John Row, commissioner for Galloway, to appear before this Assembly," when the following among other charges were made:

* That is, "the sword" of excommunication. The "Superintendent of Lothian's letter" referred to, "was penned by Mr. Knox" for the superintendent. In this letter, he says that it "pierceth many hearts" among them, "to see the hands of such as were esteemed the principal within the flock, to arm themselves * * * against a just and most lawful authority, and against the men who looked of them not only quietness and peace, but also maintenance and defense against all invasion, domestical and foreign. The consideration of this their most treasonable defection from God, from his truth professed, and from the authority most lawfully established, causeth the hearts of many godly to sob and mourn." He exhorts all such, "that they deeply consider their fearful defection from God, and from his lawful magistrates, by his word and good order erected within this realm; and that they, by condemnation, and public confession of their folly, travell (labor) speedily to return again to the bosom of the Kirk, and to the obedience due unto the magistrates, from which they have most traitorously declined." — *Culderwood, Vol. II., p. 482.*

“*Secondly*, That the said Mr. Alexander taught the people most perverse and ungodly doctrine ; but specially, in persuading, enticing, and exhorting, to rebel against our sovereign lord, and to join with manifest rebels and conjured enemies. *Thirdly*, The said Mr. Alexander, contrary to the act of the General Assembly made for the prayer of our sovereign lord, etc., most maliciously transgressed the said ordinance, not only refusing to do the same, but also avowing in his prayer another authority, and accusing and condemning all true ministers that did not the like that he did. * * * *Fifthly*, The said Mr. Alexander being sworn by his solemn oath, for due obedience to our sovereign lord, and his Grace’s regent and authority, came in the contrary thereof, and violated and brake his said former oath, but specially sitting in a pretended parliament, for dispossessing of our said sovereign lord of his royal crown and authority. *Sixthly*, The said Mr. Alexander, being one of the pretended Privy Council, after the horrible slaughter of Matthew, Earl of Lennox, regent to our sovereign lord, of good memory, gave thanks for the same, and other such like, in pulpit openly to God ; and exhorted the people to do the same, saying, it was God’s most just judgment that fell upon him ; and as God then began to execute his most just judgment upon him, he would not fail to execute the same upon the rest ; comparing oftentimes our said sovereign lord, his regents and true lieges, to Pharaoh and wicked Absalom, and himself to Moses and David whom God would defend. *Lastly*, By reason that the heinous faults of the said Mr. Alexander have been so notoriously known to all men, * * * to the great and heavy slander of God’s true word and professors thereof ; wherethrough many of the said professors, and others our sovereign lord’s true and obedient subjects, same time by him perverted, yet still remain in their wicked conceived error, and can scarce be persuaded in the contrary, except the said Mr. Alexander be caused to confess his error publicly, in all places where he hath offended : but specially in all the aforesaid kirks.”—*Culderwood, Vol. III., p. 289.*

Here were charges of refusing to pray for the lawful government, as a previous Assembly had ordained ; openly aiding rebellion, and leading the people into it, by preaching and praying in its behalf, and recognizing a rebel government ; violating his oath of allegiance, etc. The “said Mr. Alexander” pleads to this indictment, “the godly Act of Pacification, made by the procurement of the Queen’s Majesty of England, with consent of my lord regent’s Grace,” under which he claimed to be absolved by the civil power ; and, on

the other hand, while not denying the facts charged, he pleads to the jurisdiction of the spiritual court: "Therefore, your Wisdoms can be no competent judges of us, or any of us, contained in the aforesaid Act of Pacification; * * * neither can your Wisdoms have further jurisdiction over me, nor over the rest of the communicants contained in the said Act of Pacification, for the causes aforesaid." The Assembly, however, did not admit the plea, but proceeded to pass sentence, requiring public confession and repentance, prescribing the period within which it must be made, and enjoining him "to obey the aforesaid injunctions, under the pain of excommunication; with certification, that if he obey not, the Assembly commandeth the minister of Edinburgh or Holyrood House to proceed to excommunication against him. * * * The bishop was enjoined to obey before the 20th day of September, and Mr. Roger to send this ordinance, duly executed, before the said 20th day of September, to the kirk of Edinburgh, as he would be answerable to the General Assembly." This was something beyond action *in these* upon treason and rebellion against the civil authority.

The thirty-sixth General Assembly met in Edinburgh on the 24th day of April, 1578. This body proclaimed a Public Fast to be observed in all the churches. Among the reasons assigned for appointing it, were, the "ungodly sedition and division within the bowels of this realm; * * * for these causes, and that God of his mercy would bless the King's Highness and his regiment, and make him to have a godly and prosperous government, as also, to put in his Highness' heart, and in the hearts of his noble estates in Parliament, * * * to make and establish good and politic laws, for the weal and good government of the realm."

The forty-third General Assembly was held in Edinburgh, commencing on the 17th day of October, 1581. This Assembly had a case of "preaching politics" before it, as it would be termed in our day by some declaimers; and so King James thought, but the Assembly judged otherwise. It was charged that Mr. Walter Balcanquhall "had said in the pulpit, that within these four years, popery had entered into the country, not only in the court but in the king's hall, and was maintained by the tyranny of a great champion, who is called

Grace; and if His Grace would oppose himself to God's word, he should have little grace." Reference is made here to His Grace the Duke of Lennox, cousin to the king; and the charge is made before the Assembly in the King's name.

"Mr. Walter craved license to answer," and "praised God that he was not accused of anything wherein, either civilly or criminally, in his life and conversation, he had offended the King's Majesty or his laws, whereunto, with all reverence, and at all times, he is ready to submit himself; but is accused of things he hath spoken publicly in the pulpit, wherein he hath been more plain in reprovng of vice than some men can goodly suffer; which is a point of his doctrine, which howbeit he heareth there called open slander, yet he must justify the same; that, although all the kings in the earth would call it erroneous, yet he is ready here by good reason to prove it to be the very truth of God; and, if need require, to seal it with his blood. * * * Wherefore, with all reverence, he would submit himself *simpliciter* to their goodly judgments always."

The Assembly "desired his Majesty to send commissioners to see this matter tried, seeing the Assembly is most willing to try the same." This desire was twice expressed through a committee, but "the king and council were so occupied that the brethren directed got no answer." Mr. Walter made no denial of the facts charged, but simply claimed his right as a minister to utter what he had done. After hearing the whole case, "the Assembly voted, and without contradiction declared, that he had uttered nothing in that sermon erroneous, scandalous, or offensive, but solid, good, and true doctrine; for which they praised God." And thus the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland judicially sanction this "mixing of politics and religion" in the pulpit! and praise God for the mixture! *

*As a specimen of the sermon thus approved, and embracing a portion of what was complained of, we give the following: "And now, brethren, to be plain in this matter, while they that fear God ripely consider these things, they are compelled to fear these things to be the fruits of our French court, which, if they be, I pray God keep us from the like, or worse. For if these things continue and go forward, I will tell thee, O Scotland, and these that fear the Lord within thee, thou shalt repent that ever this French court came into Scotland, or that ever thou saw it, or the fruits thereof, with thy eyes. * * * *Secondly*, Whereas, our King's Majesty, from his infancy, was trained and brought up in the fear of God, and by the mercy of God yet continueth thereunto; where before, no profane person durst come in his Grace chamber or presence, his Grace's ears are now offended

The forty-eighth General Assembly convened in Edinburgh, on the 10th day of October, 1583. This was the last Assembly in regular, uninterrupted succession, which was held during the period immediately under consideration; and the last that can be regarded as strictly free in the enjoyment of its spiritual functions, by reason of the encroachments of civil power. No Assembly was held in either of the years immediately following, viz., 1584 and 1585. For several years previous, Jesuit and Erastian influences had been at work, by which the reformation had been rolled backward and the "noble old kirk" again well nigh brought into bondage. These things our subject did not require us to notice. During these sad and troubled times, the Assembly was striving, by "petitions," "supplications," and an exhibition of "greeses," to maintain its full, spiritual jurisdiction; while the enemies of the truth were equally zealous, and more successful, in their endeavors to put upon the neck of the kirk the yoke of vassalage to the state. The king was beset by both parties, and at times seemed to favor each. At this Assembly, an earnest appeal was made to him, and a long list of "Articles" submitted for his sanction, showing that the Assembly still spoke out boldly upon corruptions in the state, and pleaded earnestly that the jurisdiction of the church might not be farther invaded, but fully restored. In these Articles, she speaks as follows :

"SIR: The strait commission we have received of the Eternal, our God, when as in this your Majesty's realm we were made watchmen of his people, and fearful threatening pronounced against such as neglect faithfully to execute every part of their weighty charge, compelleth us, presently to have recourse unto your Majesty, perceiving many things to fall forth greatly to the prejudice of God's glory, and no small appearance of utter wreck of this his kirk and commonwealth, unless some hasty remedy be put thereto; most humbly, therefore, beseeching your Majesty diligently to weigh and consider these few heads, which, with all reverence and observance, we present, looking for a gracious answer, and speedy redress thereof." Passing by the first three heads,

by a profane French ruffian, who, if he were in any other reformed country, would rather be hanged before the sun, than to be suffered to pollute the ears of so good and so godly a young prince; who, if he were not removed in time, they that fear God will repent that ever they saw him, or them that brought him here."

—Calderwood, Vol. III., p. 774, Appendix.

in which the Assembly speak of the advance of Popery, they "mix politics and religion" as follows: "That your Majesty seemeth to have over good liking of the enemies of God, as well in France as some within this realm, who have never given testimony of any good meaning, either in religion or in your Majesty's service; beside the dissolute life, and irreligious behavior of them that, in your Grace's service, have succeeded to men that were known zealous in God's cause, and faithful to your Grace in your tender age. * * * There is a sore murmur among your Grace's lieges, and a lamentable complaint that the laws of the country have no place; that no man can be sure, neither of his land, life, or goods, which threateneth a miserable confusion, and the heavy hand of God to ensue thereupon; that oftentimes your Majesty interponeth your Highness' authority, by letters of harning, to stop the execution of the acts made in the General Assembly, in matters properly belonging to the kirk, and nothing touching the civil estate.* *Last*, We most humbly beseech your Majesty to suffer us to lament this great division among your Highness' nobility and subjects, the one part seeking by all means possible to wreck the other; which fostereth a continual strife, malice, and rancor, to the great danger of your Grace's person, whom God preserve to the kirk of God and this poor country; beseeching your Majesty, for the tender mercy of God, to call to your Highness some of the most wise, discreet, and indifferent, and by their counsel to take a moderate course, that unquiet spirits may be bridled, good men cherished and entertained, and the hearts of all your Majesty's subjects united, to the maintenance of God's glory, preservation of your royal estate, and comfort of all them that bewail this miserable condition."—*Culderwood, Vol. III., p. 734.*

While the Assembly here express their undoubted loyalty, and urge their suit with becoming humility, it will be noticed that it is with great plainness of speech and commendable faithfulness that the spiritual court addresses the civil power. Nor did the Assembly for a moment suppose that in the subject-matter of their address they were treading on forbidden ground. In reply to these Articles of the Assembly, the king sent a very respectful letter, noticing each head in detail, and covering a much larger space than the Assembly's paper. He made many fair promises, and could he have been freed

* "Letters of harning," in Scottish law, are a process issued from a court of competent jurisdiction in the name of the king, against a debtor or for other claim, requiring the claim to be liquidated within a time named, under penalty of incurring the charge of rebellion against the state.

from his counsellors and flatterers, he perhaps would have fulfilled them. With becoming deference, he writes to the Assembly: "The Tenth head being general, his Majesty would be glad not only to have it explained, but to hear all good advices that shall be offered to him, for reformation of that which may be found amiss; and how his laws may have place, and justice be ministered, to the comfort and common benefit of all his good subjects."

As before stated, after the forty-eighth General Assembly, in 1583, whose acts we have just noticed, the body did not convene for two years. The encroachments of the civil power, forbidding the Assembly to meet without the king's express authority, and postponing the day named for meeting from time to time, seriously invaded the freedom of the church; and when at length the meetings were again held, corruption within the body had become so widespread, through Jesuit intrigues and promotion by the favor of the king and his council, that a majority were frequently found ready to do the king's bidding, while a few faithful men protested in vain, receiving a reward in imprisonment or exile. Walter Balcanquhall's prophecy was now rapidly being fulfilled: "If these things continue and go forward, I will tell thee, O! Scotland! and these that fear the Lord within thee, thou shalt repent that ever this French court came into Scotland, or that ever thou saw it, or the fruits thereof, with thine eyes!"

As a slight evidence of the deterioration of the kirk, as seen in its highest court, we notice an act of the General Assembly, convened at Dundee, on the 24th of April, 1593. The order of proceedings was now reversed, and instead of the Assembly expressing its will in Articles to be sent to the king, as formerly, we find the king dictating to the Assembly acts for its adoption. A long list appears, entitled, "The Articles propounded in his Majesty's name to the General Assembly, presently convened at Dundee." We give but a brief extract:

"His Majesty declareth, that in respect he can not of honor see his crown hurt, therefore he will have regard to see the act of his Parliament kept concerning the convening of the General Assemblies by his Majesty's appointment. * * * Secondly, His Majesty desireth them to make an act of their Assembly, prohibiting all and every one of the

ministry, under the power of deprivation, to declaim against his Majesty or council's proceedings in pulpit, not only in respect to his Majesty's known good intention for the furthering of piety and justice, but likewise, because his Majesty at all times giveth ready access and loving care to sundry of the ministry, to inform, debate, or complain, either in their own name, or in the name of any of the rest of the brethren."—*Calderwood, Vol. V., p. 242.*

The Assembly shows its ready compliance with the king's will, by the "humble answers" returned. In regard to the meeting of the body, it assents, "according to the tenor of the act of Parliament," allowing the king to name the time and place; thus surrendering, without a struggle, with some honorable exceptions, a right which in previous years it strenuously claimed to belong to its sole jurisdiction. But the most noticeable part of its proceedings is its prompt acquiescence in the restriction which the king desired to have put upon the pulpit.

"As touching the second Article, it is ordained by the whole Assembly, that no minister within the realm utter from the pulpit any rash or unreverend speeches against his Majesty or council, or their proceedings; but that all their public admonitions proceed upon just and necessary causes, and sufficient warrant, in all fear, love, and reverence, under the pain of deposing such as do in the contrary from their function and office of the ministry."—*Calderwood, Vol. V., p. 244.*

At the very next General Assembly, convened in Edinburgh, on the 7th day of May, 1594, a case of "preaching politics" came before the body, under the foregoing Article which they had adopted at Dundee, in the preceding year. The charge was brought at the instance of the king, and the whole proceedings in the case, detailed at great length, reveal on the one hand a desire to comply with their own statute and meet the wishes of the king, and on the other a still lingering conviction of the true province of the spiritual authority, and the obligations of the pulpit to be faithful to its mission. They appoint a committee of thirteen, of whom Walter Balcalquall (whose similar case, decided in his favor thirteen years before) was one, "to treat upon the offense conceived by the king against John Rosse." The committee report:

"1. In respect he delivered that doctrine, at that time, when his Majesty's rebels and enemies were assembled in the fields; wherethrough it might appear to the people that the kirk allowed Bothwell's treasonable attempts, and that the Assembly, of purpose, had placed him in that room, to alienate the hearts of his people from his Majesty's obedience. * * * 3. In respect to the hard delivery of speeches spoken of his Majesty, which might have been thought to have craved greater years and farther experience. Further, the whole brethren, both of the conference and of the Provincial of Perth, all in one voice acknowledged, that there is just cause of a sharp rebuke, and threatening of heavier judgments forth of the grounds of that text, than hath been or might have been uttered by him; and whatsoever he uttered, as he deposed before God, and upon his conscience, he uttered it out of love, seeking always his Majesty's standing; of no preoccupied mind, prejudged opinion, or troubled affection, but of a soul thirsting, and seeking always his Majesty's honor and weal in God; and therefore approves his whole doctrine in that point, as it has been read and declared by himself, in such heads as seem to be most offensive. * * * And being minded to satisfy his Majesty always, so far as possible may be with a good conscience, after earnest incalling of the name of God, for assistance of his Spirit, and long advisement, have found it good that the admonition of the Provincial of Perth, as said is, be revered of the said whole General Assembly; and that the General Assembly at this time, give farther the said John Rosse a grave and earnest admonition to speak at all times reverently, and with such wisdom of his Majesty, as he always may have so clear a warrant of his speeches as may fully satisfy his own conscience before God, and have the approbation and allowance of all the godly brethren. And that this admonition be extended to all other young men of the ministry, and to the whole Assembly." So far the report of the committee of thirteen; of which the Assembly say: "Which judgment of the said brethren being well considered by the whole Assembly, after good deliberation, voted to the approbation of their said judgment, and allowed the same in all points. And thereafter, the said John Rosse being called in, * * * the Moderator, at command of the said Assembly, in the name and fear of God, admonished the said brother, and all other young men of the ministry, and the whole Assembly, in all time coming, to speak so reverently and discreetly of his Majesty, that they may have so clear warrant of their speeches as may fully satisfy their own conscience before God, and have approbation and allowance of all the godly, and his Majesty have no just cause of complaint and misliking in time coming. Which admonition the said John with all humility revered."—*Culderwood, Vol. V., p. 321.*

The plain English of the foregoing Scotch is, that the As-

sembly yet retained so strong a sense of what was demanded of them as a spiritual court, and of what was due to the sacredness of the pulpit, which they were set to guard, that they "approved" the said John's "whole doctrine" complained of; but yet, "being minded to satisfy his Majesty always," they punished the said John by administering through the Moderator, "a grave and earnest admonition!" And then, apparently, to ease the matter a little from the shoulders of the said John, they punish in like manner "all other young men of the ministry!" And then, to satisfy their consciences for having inflicted this gratuitous punishment, they gravely conclude to visit it upon themselves; and so "the Moderator, at the command of the said Assembly," "admonished the whole Assembly!" And to make thorough work of the matter, so that they would not have it to do over again, the punishment of all of them was inflicted for "all time coming!" And the whole winds up with the important record: "Which admonition the said John with all humility revered." But whether the others relished their punishment is not found in Calderwood.

The king seemed scarcely to have anticipated such prompt compliance with his will in the case of John Rosse, and therefore sent to this Assembly, before he had been made aware of their action, another long list of "Articles proposed in his Majesty's name to the said General Assembly at Edinburgh," in which he reiterates his will upon points previously submitted, and presents others. The matter of fettering the pulpit was a vital point with him. Not feeling confident that the act touching this point passed during the previous year at Dundee, under which the said John had been both acquitted and punished, would be carried out in good faith, the King urges upon the Assembly, "that they will ratify and approve, by act of this present Assembly, their promise made to his Majesty in their foresaid last Assembly," that the ministry should "not utter publicly in pulpit any unreverend speeches against his Majesty's person, council, or estates, under the pain of deprivation;" and then he presents the following:

"3. That they will excommunicate Mr. Andrew Hunter, for bringing in a scandal upon their profession, as the first open traitor of their faction, against a Christian King of their own religion, and their natural

sovereign. 4. That by act of the Assembly, they will ordain every particular minister within their charge to dissuade, as well by public as private exhortation, the flocks committed to their care, from concurring with the treasonable attempts of Bothwell, or any other traitors that arise, or shall raise themselves up, against the lawful authority placed by God in his Majesty's person; and specially, that they shall narrowly take heed and not suffer any of their flocks to be seduced, under color of religion, or whatsoever false pretexts, to receive wages or become soldiers for service of any persons, except they see his Majesty's commission and warrant thereunto; and namely, of Bothwell, who has presently, in divers parts of this realm, attempted the same."—*Calderwood, Vol. V., p. 325.*

The Assembly's action, sent to the King, upon the points noted above, is as follows:

"2. The act made by the General Assembly at Dundee, is, *de novo*, ratified and approved. 3. Touching Mr. Andrew Hunter, the Assembly hath proceeded and given a sentence of deposition for his offence against him, until he satisfy his Majesty and the Kirk. 4. Every particular minister, within his charge, is straitly commanded to dissuade their flocks, as well by public as private exhortations, from concurring with the treasonable attempts of Bothwell, or any other traitor to his Majesty, that raiseth or shall raise themselves up against his authority. And such like to take heed, and suffer not their flocks, under color of religion, or whatever false pretexts, to receive wages of any persons without his Majesty's warrant; and namely, of the said Bothwell." Upon this action of the Assembly, the historian remarks: "Mr. Andrew Hunter was deposed from the function of the ministry, because he deserted his flock, was fugitive from the laws, and was bruited and suspected to have joined himself with the King's rebels; and that till he satisfied the King and the Kirk for his offence. He had followed Bothwell, and being forced to leave the country, became a minister unto soldiers in the low countries."—*Calderwood, Vol. V., page 324, et seq.*

If anybody's portrait is here drawn, leaving out the single lineament of "deposition," the artist is Calderwood. Though painted from life, nearly three hundred years ago, it is a life-like picture of certain ministers of the present day. If the duty of pastors to their flocks, "as well by public as private exhortations," is here "straitly commanded;" and if the duty of church courts in case of the delinquency of pastors in the premises is here set forth by example in an instance of

actual deposition, and more especially in case pastors by "private exhortations" exert a contrary influence among their flocks; all this is done by the venerable Kirk of Scotland, whose wisdom in the department of church polity, some among us are accustomed, and justly, so much to admire and commend.

In the year 1595, the General Assembly met at Montrose, on the 24th of June. In this Assembly, "an ordinance upon treason" was adopted, wherein they declare "against practitioners of any treasonable enterprise or conspiracy against his Highness' person or estate, being found and declared culpable thereof by law, that they therefore shall incur the sentence of excommunication; the General Assembly agreeth thereunto, *legitima cognitione, ecclesiastica præeunte*."—*Calderwood, Vol. V., p. 368.*

We find similar testimonies in the action of many more General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland, but these will suffice. The Acts and Deliverances which we have cited, from the supreme judicatory of a church, to which, in the department of government and discipline, the Presbyterian Church in the United States is more closely allied than to any other, sustain and illustrate with unquestionable plainness the doctrine we have attempted to establish. They show: (1). Most explicit commands to pastors and people to obey, support, and pray for, their lawful civil rulers. (2). Solemn and formal acts declaring and denouncing treason and rebellion. (3). Injunctions to pastors to instruct their flocks in the duty of obedience to civil rulers, and to warn them, publicly and privately, against countenancing or joining in treason and rebellion, under pain of excommunication for default therein. (4). Cases of actual deposition and excommunication, for commission of these sins and omission of these duties. (5). Decided rebukes by the Assembly itself of open sin in rulers, and solemn judgments sustaining pastors in such rebukes when judicially charged with fault for uttering them in the pulpit; with explicit pointing out to kings and all magistrates their religious duties, and an earnest assertion of the spiritual independence of the church; and firm remonstrances against the encroachments of the civil power. (6). And, finally, that in doing all this, the General Assembly did not deem that they

were going beyond their commission as a spiritual court, and meddling with politics; nor was this point made by any one of the body in any of their earnest discussions, but all conceded these to be among the most manifest duties of the church as imposed by her Divine Head and clearly enunciated in the Holy Scriptures.

In the light of these indisputable facts, is it strange, or is it not, that certain men who are specially enamored of the government and discipline of the Church of Scotland, can in this day overlook these fundamental principles which mark her whole history, or take an open position against their imitation by the church in the United States in this time of treason and rebellion, and denounce those who follow these noble examples, with "preaching and praying politics," and with "confounding the spiritual and civil jurisdictions," and with "mixing politics and religion?" No: it is not strange.

One point remains to fill the measure of testimony by which we proposed to illustrate the position we have taken. While it is so fully sustained by the action of church courts, it is further elucidated from the *Published Writings of Men of various branches and periods of the Church*, who are acknowledged as among the brightest stars of the ecclesiastical firmament. As we have taken so much space upon other branches of the subject, we must be briefer than we could wish upon this. Volumes might be filled, or rather are filled, with this testimony. We will give a few instances.

The name of Robert Hall is one of the most illustrious of the British Church of any period or denomination. As a pulpit *instructor*, it is perhaps not extravagant to say that he has had few if any superiors in any age of the church. His works abound with matter to the point in hand. In aiming to show "the Relation Christianity bears to Civil Government," he says: "Though Christianity does not assume any immediate direction in the affairs of government, it inculcates those duties and recommends that spirit which will ever prompt us to cherish the principles of freedom." He further says: "As ministers are appointed to teach the whole compass of social duty, the mutual obligations of rulers and subjects will of necessity fall under their notice, and they can not explain and enforce the reasons of submission without

displaying the proper end of government, and the expectations we may naturally form from it; which, when accurately done, will lead into the very depths of political science." And still further: "On this principle do the Dissenters proceed, when they call for a repeal of the Test Act; when they lament the unequal representation in Parliament; when they wish to see a period to ministerial corruption, and to the encroachments of a hierarchy equally servile and oppressive." And Mr. Hall mentions among the bright names of those who coincide with him in the principles he is advancing, Owen, Howe, Baxter, and others, commending them as "some of the most devout and venerable characters that ever appeared," and who "held sentiments on the subject of government as free, and were as warmly attached to liberty," as any others in the world. We have not space to quote from these renowned men.—*Hall's Works, Vol. III.*

Do we go to Scotland? What better type of the status of the ministry of that realm upon the question in hand, marking two great eras of the Scotch Church, than Knox, the Melvilles, Davidson, and their coadjutors, of the former period, and Chalmers and his associates of a later day? An example or two must suffice. Says Dr. McCrie of the Scottish ministry of the Presbyterian Church as a body, in his *Life of John Knox, the heroic Reformer*: "They continued to profess not only their allegiance to their sovereign, but also their readiness to obey the Queen Regent, in everything not inconsistent with their security, and the liberties of the nation." In this spirit, Knox wrote for himself and his coadjutors, in one of the most troubled times in Scottish history, in the reign of the unfortunate Mary: "The Queen is retired to Dunbar. The end is known only to God. We mean no tumult, no alteration of authority; but only the reformation of religion and suppression of idolatry." At another time, Knox wrote: "In few words, to speak my conscience, the regiment of princes is this day come to that heap of iniquity, that no godly man can brook office or authority under them, but in so doing he shall be compelled, not only against equity and justice to oppress the poor, but also expressly to fight against God and his ordinance. * * * And what must follow hereof, but that either princes be reformed, and be compelled also to

reform their wicked laws, or else all good men depart from their service and company." To the Queen Dowager, after her suspension from the regency, he wrote: "my tongue did both persuade and obtain, that your authority and regiment should be obeyed of us in all things lawful, till ye declare yourself open enemy to this commonwealth; as now, alas, ye have done!" And Knox, in his several interviews with Queen Mary, sought and commanded by her, boldly laid down the principles which the class of her subjects he represented, felt bound to adhere to, as enjoined on them to maintain and teach others, involving the setting forth of the nature and principles of civil government in their relations to the church, in their pulpit ministrations. But this is all too familiar to need citation. The whole history of the Scottish Church and ministry of that period is but a vindication of the position we have taken.

A bold testimony to the right of the pulpit was uttered by John Davidson in 1596, in reply to King James the VI. of Scotland, and before the General Assembly. The king visited the Assembly in person, and took part in the proceedings, contending for his rights against the ministry. His speech is thus reported, with Davidson's reply:

"The king granted he was a sinner, as other men were, but not infected, he trusted, with any gross sin and therefore required, that no preacher would inveigh against him or his council publicly, but to come to him or them privately, and tell what is the offense; and as for himself, if he mended not, in case he were guilty, they might deal publicly: his chamber-door should be made patent to the meanest minister in Scotland; there would not be any mean gentleman in Scotland more subject to the good order and discipline of the kirk than he would be. For he acknowledged his standing to be joined with the standing of religion, and affirmed that he had never any intelligence with the common enemies, nor ever promised them countenance or aid." Mr. Davidson replied to the king, "concerning the duty of the ministry in reproving his Majesty." He said: "Ye hear, brethren, his Majesty's offer. Therefore, in the name of God I exhort you, discharge your duty at this time, seeing in this public defection, and now, when God is threatening us for the same, every estate hath its own gross sins, as we have already seen in the trials of the ministry; * * * otherwise, I protest, if ye fail therein, that we that are the servants of Christ, shall find fault both with you and his Majesty, as becomes us. But whether

yonder way that his Majesty speaketh of, by admonishing privately for open sin, and manifest continuing therein, if it be according to the word of God, ye are to judge. I speak this for the liberty of our message, that are Christ's servants, and as a free Scotchman, as ever I have been, and mean by God's grace so to die." This speech was so well received by the Assembly, that the historian says: "Mr. Davidson's freedom for the freedom of God's messengers, and that in the king's presence, before so frequent an Assembly, was so commended by the godly, that they wished it might be registered in the Assembly's books, for a testimony to posterity."—*Calderwood*, Vol. V, p. 398.

It was during this same year, that Andrew Melville, one of the Assembly's commissioners, appointed to look after the interests of the kirk, had his famous conferences with the king, in which he boldly asserted the rights of the ministry and the spiritual independence of the church. The king called a convention "of his estates" at Falkland. Ministers were invited to attend, but only "such as the king could dress for his purpose." Melville attended, though uninvited. The ministers were called in by name, after the king and the magnates were seated. Melville "was omitted, but he came in with the foremost." The king having expressed his disapprobation that he had come unbidden, Melville replied :

"Sir, I have a calling to come here from the King, Christ Jesus, and his kirk, who has special interest in this turn, and against whom this convention is directly assembled; charging you and your estates, in the name of Christ and his kirk, that ye favor not his enemies whom he hateth, nor go about to call home, and make citizens, these who have traitorously sought to betray their city and native country to the Spaniard, with the overthrow of Christ's Kingdom." And the historian adds: "And breaking on in particular upon the greatest part of that convention, with plain speech and mighty force of zeal, challenged them of the treason both against Christ and the king, and kirk and country, in that purpose and counsel they were about. The king interrupted him, and commanded him to go out; whose command he obeyed, thanking God that he had gotten his message discharged."—*Calderwood*, Vol. V, p. 438.

Soon after this, it becoming apparent that the purpose for which the convention at Falkland was called, was likely to be executed, the "commissioners appointed by the General Assembly to see to the dangers of the kirk at all occasions,"

consisting of Andrew Melville, Patrick Galloway, James Nicolson, and James Melville, "came to Falkland, where they found the king very quiet." The scene which followed is thus graphically described: "The rest laid upon Mr. James Melville to be speaker, alleging he could propone the matter substantially, and in a mild and smooth manner, which the king liked best of. And entering in the cabinet with the king alone, Mr. James shew his Majesty that the commissioners of the General Assembly, with certain other brethren, ordained to watch for the weal of the kirk in so dangerous a time, had convened at Cowper. At the which word the king interrupted him, and crabbedly querrelled their meeting, alleging it was without warrant, and seditious, making themselves and the country to conceive fear, where there was no cause. To the which, Mr. James, beginning to reply in his manner, Mr. Andrew could not abide it, but broke off upon the king in so zealous, powerful, and unresistible a manner, that howbeit the king used his authority in most crabbed and cholerick manner, yet Mr. Andrew bore him down, and uttered the commission as from the mighty God, calling the king but God's silly vassal, and taking him by the sleeve, sayeth this in effect, through much hot reasoning, and many interruptions:

"SIR: We will humbly reverence your Majesty always, namely, in public; but since we have the occasion to be with your Majesty in private, the truth is ye are brought in extreme danger both of your life and crown, and with you the country and kirk of Christ is like to wreck, *for not telling you the truth, and giving you a faithful counsel; we must discharge our duty therein, or else be traitors both to Christ and you.* And, therefore, Sir, as divers times before, so now again I must tell you, *that there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland: there is Christ Jesus, and his kingdom the Kirk, whose subject King James the Sixth is, and of whose Kingdom not a King, nor a head, nor a lord, but a member; and they whom Christ has called, and commanded to watch over his Kirk, and govern his spiritual kingdom, have sufficient power of him, and authority so to do, both together and severally, the which no Christian king nor prince should control and discharge, but fortify and assist, otherwise not faithful subjects, nor members of Christ.* And, Sir, when you were in your swaddling clouts, Jesus Christ reigned freely in this land, in spite of all his enemies; and his officers and ministers convened and assembled, for the ruling and weal of his kirk, which was ever for your welfare, defense, and preservation: also, when these same

enemies were seeking your destruction and cutting off; and, in so doing, by their Assemblies and meetings ever since, continually have been terrible to these enemies and most steadable for you. And will ye now, when there is more necessity of the continuance and faithful discharge of their duty (drawing to your own destruction, by a devilish and pernicious counsel), begin to hinder and dishaunt Christ's servants, and your best and most faithful subjects, querrelling them for their convening, and care that they have of their duty to Christ and you, when ye should rather commend and countenance them, as the godly kings and good emperors did? As to the wisdom of your counsel, which I call devilish and pernicious, it is this: that ye must be served with all sorts of men, to come to your purpose and grandeur, Jew and Gentile, Papist and Protestant. And because the ministers and Protestants in Scotland are over strong and control the king, they must be weakened and brought low, by stirring up a party to them, and the king being equal and indifferent, both shall be fain to flee to him. So shall he be well served. But, Sir, if God's wisdom be the only true wisdom, this will prove more and mad folly; for his curse can not but light upon it, so that, in seeking of both ye shall lose both; whereas, in cleaving uprightly to God, his true servants should be your sure friends, and he should compel the rest counterfootedlie and beinglie to give over themselves, and serve you, as he did to David." — *Calderwood, Vol. V., p. 440.*

When we come down to the period of another great Reformation in Scotland, that of the Exodus and of the establishment of the Free Church, in 1843, we find no brighter name than that of Thomas Chalmers. In his *Lectures on Romans* (chap. 13), in speaking of our obligations to the Civil Government, he says:

"It is a lesson altogether worthy of strenuous and repeated enforcement from the pulpit, from which there ought to be exposed and denounced with all fidelity, the shameful laxity which obtains in this department of moral obligation. It is a most befitting topic for the ministrations of a clergyman. * * * There is a hebetude of conscience on this subject which needs the quickening of an earnest and solemn and scriptural representation. This were not to secularize religion; but, what is mainly wanted, it were to sanctify the business of human life. * * * That is a fatal error which would dis sever the social from the sacred; or which looks in the great amount of them on the moralities of human conduct, though specified and prescribed in the Bible, merely in the light of so many weekday proprieties. * * *

A government in the discharge of its ordinary functions is a great blessing to society ; and it is upon this consideration that the duties of the passage now under review are grounded and enforced by the Apostle.

* * * *Heaven grant an apostolic wisdom, as well as an apostolic boldness, on the part of her ministers—that they may acquit themselves rightly of all which they owe both to God and to Cæsar; and so that, while faithful to their Master in heaven, their loyalty to the powers which be on earth, may, in all that is possible, and as far as lieth in them, become patent and palpable to all men."*

Similar testimonies may be found among all the leading Reformers of Continental Europe ; among the divines of England and Scotland of the seventeenth century, an age than which there is none richer in ecclesiastical lore ; and among the descendants of these men, of the present day, in every country under the whole heavens.

Dr. Hodge (*Princeton Review*, July, 1859) says : "It follows from the great commission of the church, that it is her prerogative and duty to testify for the truth and law of God, wherever she can make her voice heard ; not only to her own people, but to kings and rulers, to Jews and Gentiles. * * * If magistrates transcend the limits of their authority, and trespass on the divine law, she is bound to raise her voice in remonstrance and warning. * * * The whole history of the Presbyterian Church in Europe and America is instinct with this spirit."

We will summon but one more witness. The name of no minister in the early history of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, is held in higher estimation, for sound doctrine, for fervid eloquence, and for great success in the ministry, than that of Samuel Davies. His name is a household word among the Lord's people in Virginia, and his fame is well established on both sides of the Atlantic. Though born in what was then the Province of Pennsylvania, and in the latter part of his life President of the College of New Jersey ("Nassau Hall"), the larger part of his ministry was spent in Virginia. His biographer says of him :

"President Davies was an ardent and devoted friend of his country. He lived in the forming period of our history, and he exerted his great influence in vindication of his country's rights. The country was

alarmed and agitated to the highest degree by the French and Indian war, while he was a pastor in Virginia. There was even much talk of abandoning a part of the colony of Virginia to the enemy. On the 10th of July, 1755, General Braddock sustained his memorable defeat, and the remnant of his army was saved by the courage and skill of Colonel Washington, then only twenty-three years old. On the 20th of this month Mr. Davies preached a sermon, entitled, 'On the defeat of General Braddock, going to Fort Du Quesne.' * * * In August of the same year, he delivered a sermon in Hanover, to Captain Overton's company of independent volunteers, under the title of 'Religion and Patriotism the constituents of a good Soldier.' As a preacher, President Davies was eminently fitted to the times in which he lived. He was one of the great men whom God raised up at that time to impress their features on the age, and to mould the opinions of their countrymen. He was such a preacher as the times then demanded, and such a preacher, in the great features of his ministry, as this age also demands. * * * It will be an honor to tread in the footsteps of such men."

Thus far we have the view of his biographer, written more than twenty years ago, introducing to the public three volumes of his sermons. In this collection are some half dozen or more of what are called "Patriotic Sermons," preached within a period of three or four years, several in one year, and on the Sabbath, showing that President Davies frequently brought these subjects before the people. The titles, affixed by their author, are significant. Two are given above. Others are as follows: "The Curse of Cowardice;" and "The Signs of the Times;" and "On the death of his late Majesty, King George II.;" and "Serious Reflections on War;" and several others. Had he fallen into some hands in our day, these things would have stamped him as a "sensational preacher." But if these titles merit censure, the matter of his sermons still more. He would be called a "political preacher," and denounced as prostituting the pulpit, and his office to ends secular and profane. Let us see. Near the close of his sermon on the death of King George II., preached in the College of New Jersey, he says:

"The Christian can not but be a patriot. He who loves all mankind, even his enemies, must certainly love his country. The Christian can not but be a good subject. * * * 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers.' This, my dear youth, this is the great precept of Christianity which this day demands your attention. From this day cherish

a public spirit, and dedicate yourselves to the service of your king and country. * * * This you must do, or turn rebels against your own hearts and consciences. * * * Then you will give the world an honorable and just specimen of the morals and politics inculcated in the College of New Jersey ; and convince them that it is a *Seminary of loyalty* as well as learning and piety ; a nursery for the state as well as the church. Such may it always continue ! You all concur in your cordial Amen." In a sermon to Captain Overton's volunteers he said : " And, Virginians ! Britons ! Christians ! Protestants ! if these names have any import or energy, will you not strike home in such a cause ? Yes, this view of the matter must fire you into men ; methinks the cowardly soul must tremble, lest the imprecation of the Prophet fall upon him, ' Cursed be the man that keepeth his sword back from blood.' *To this shocking but necessary work, the Lord now calls you*, and, ' cursed is he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully '—that will not put his hand to it when it is in his power, or that will not perform it with all his might. (Jer xlvi : 10). * * * Let the event be what it will, it will afford us satisfaction to think that we have done the best we could. We can not command success ; but let us do all in our power to obtain it, and we have reason to hope that in this way we shall not be disappointed ; but if it should please God to render all our endeavors vain, still we shall have the generous pleasure to reflect, *that we have not been accessory to the ruin of our country, but have done all we could for its deliverance.*" At another time, he " preached to the militia of Hanover county, in Virginia, at a general muster, May 8, 1758, with a view to raise a company for Captain Samuel Meredith," when he said : " Is the work of peace, then, our only business ? No : in such a time, even the God of Peace proclaims by his providence, ' To arms ! ' Then the sword is, as it were, consecrated to God ; *and the art of war becomes a part of our religion.* Then happy is he that shall reward our enemies as they have served us. (Psalm cxxxvii : 8.) Blessed is the brave soldier ; blessed is the defender of his country, and the destroyer of its enemies. * * * But on the other hand, our text says, " cursed is he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully ; and cursed is he that keepeth back his sword from blood." * * * I am to lay before you a brief view of the present circumstances of our country, *which render the war in which we are engaged, the work of the Lord, which consecrate swords as instruments of righteousness, and call us to the dreadful but important duty of shedding human blood, upon penalty of falling under the tremendous curse of God.* * * * Such, my brethren, such alas ! is the present state of our country : it bleeds in a thousand veins ; and without timely remedy, the wound will prove mortal. And in such circumstances is it not *our duty in the sight of God*, is it not a work to which *the Lord loudly calls*

us, to take up arms for the defense of our country? Certainly it is: and *cursed is he, who, having no ties sufficiently strong to confine him at home, keepeth his sword from blood. The man that can desert the cause of his country in such an exigency; his country, in the blessings of which he shared while in peace and prosperity; and which is therefore entitled to his sympathy and assistance in the day of its distress; that cowardly, ungrateful man, SINS AGAINST GOD AND HIS COUNTRY, AND DESERVES THE CURSE OF BOTH.* Such a conduct in such a conjuncture, *is a moral evil, a gross wickedness; and exposes the wretch to the heavy curse of God, both in this and the eternal world.* * * * Oh! for the all-prevailing force of Demosthenes' oratory—but I recall my wish that I may correct it. Oh! for the influence of the Lord of armies, the God of battles, the Author of true courage, and every heroic virtue, to fire you into patriots and soldiers this moment! * * * Ye that love your country, ENLIST, for honor will follow in life or death in such a cause. * * * I seriously make the proposal to you, not only as a subject of the best of kings, and a friend to your country, but as a servant of the Most High God; for I am fully persuaded what I am recommending is His will, and disobedience to it may expose you to His curse." On a day of Fasting and Prayer, during the continuance of the war, he said in his sermon: "If God governs the world by means of second causes, it is our duty, according to our characters, to use all proper means to defend our country, and stop the encroachments of our enemies. * * * Let us use our influence to diffuse a military spirit around us. I have no scruple thus openly to declare, that such of you whose circumstances allow of it, may not only lawfully enlist and take up arms, but that your doing so is a Christian duty, and acting an honorable part, worthy of a man, a freeman, a Briton, and a Christian." On a subsequent occasion, after victories in the war, in a discourse entitled, "A Thanksgiving Sermon for National Blessings," he says: "Providence has surprised us in one week with so many and such important turns in our favor, that loyalty, religion, and all the virtues of patriotism and Christianity united require us to take grateful notice of them. Therefore, I beg an hour of your sacred time for this purpose." After mentioning several victories by name, he proceeds: "Before the hour of victory, destined by heaven, all our attempts were in vain, and issued in inglorious defeats; but when that hour is come, the terror of the Lord falls upon our enemies, and the important acquisitions are made as without hands. The sword of the Lord and of General Amherst, gleaming from afar, strike our enemies into a panic. * * * We may naturally indulge ourselves in all natural decent expressions of joy. We may keep this day as the Jews did the days of Purim, as a day of gladness and joy, of feasting, and sending portions one to another, and

gifts to the poor. (Esther, ix : 19-22.) * * * Let us talk over the goodness of God to our king and country ; let our hearts and voices concur in his praise. Praise Him for all our successes, as their original Author."—*Life and Sermons, Vol. III.*

Thus spake Samuel Davies, from the pulpit, when his country was involved in war. We have given these extracts at some length because of the high esteem in which he has always been held as an orthodox, able and successful preacher of the Gospel. It would be in vain at this day to attempt his praise. It would be infinitely worse than in vain to say anything to his disparagement. His position has long since been immovably fixed by the unanimous judgment of the church. What, then, indeed, is really to be thought of such preaching from one of the most eminent orators that ever entered a pulpit?—a man under whose preaching Patrick Henry sat, "from his eleventh to his twenty-seventh year," and whose sermons "produced effects as powerful as those ascribed to Demosthenes," and who "first kindled the fire and afforded the model of Henry's elocution?" How shall we view this at the present day? Did Davies know what belonged to the true province of the pulpit? Who shall venture to instruct him, or who has the hardihood to become his detractor? But can any possible comparison be made between the importance of the French and Indian war then progressing, and that now threatening the destruction of the Nation? Who is so demented as to attempt it? The practical lesson which the bare asking of such questions teaches is too plain to be stated. And yet, tried by the principle laid down by some modern notions, Samuel Davies, in these sermons, would be charged with having profaned the sanctuary; and these utterances, in the elegant language of some declaimers, would be taken as evidence of "theological blood-thirst!"

And thus have spoken many of the great men of Christ's church, in various periods and countries, compared with whom none have surpassed and few have equalled them, for all that adorns the ministerial profession. They may safely be followed. They sustain and illustrate, by their pulpit ministrations, our main proposition. And now we repeat—that while

it is fully sustained by the Holy Scriptures, in their general principles and in their special teachings, upon all the subjects involved; while it is set forth in the Creeds and Confessions of the Evangelical Church Catholic, in all ages; while it is exemplified by special application to particular cases in many extended Acts and elaborate Deliverances of the Church, upon a variety of subjects, called for by immediate emergencies; and while it has been eloquently illustrated and enforced in the Pulpit of the Living Ministry of former times, who have had no superiors in the profession: on the other hand, we boldly affirm, and challenge the disproof of it, that the negative of this proposition is not sustained by any clear teachings of Holy Writ, in terms, principle, or by any fair deduction; nor by any evangelical creeds or explicit church action of former times; nor by any prominent names in the ministry of any evangelical denomination.

If, then, all this be so, why are we seriously advocating such a well-sustained proposition? It is because the times are sadly out of joint. In our day, during these recent years, men have risen up in the church—some of them, hitherto, of great influence—who declaim against this doctrine. They would bind the spouse of Christ with the green withes of their sophistry, so that she may not strike down with her Heaven-girded power the idols of the Philistines which they worship. Behind the barricade which they have erected, they would fortify the position that the pulpit and church courts must be mute, while leading men in the ministry of the church, and thousands of less note in her membership, led astray by their example, plot treason against the lawful government which protects them, and rise in armed rebellion for its overthrow. And some of these men—ministers and elders in the Presbyterian Church—are leaders in the movement, civil and military, and urge on this diabolical work with all their power. This is the specially painful view of the case, that prominent men in the church—men who have for a few years past, in our highest judicatory, loudly declaimed against the ministry and church courts for meddling with what they misname “politics”—all at once, by a sudden transformation, when their schemes are being frustrated, become the most violent preachers of poli-

tics, *pure and simple*, counsel from the pulpit open resistance to the National Government, and throw all the power of their official character and station in aid of the rebellion!

In this state of the case—when so many in the church have been led away by these high examples, and others are in danger—the pulpit would be recreant to its duty, and the church would deserve the curse of Heaven, did she not, through her ministry and courts, cry aloud and spare not, lift up her voice like a trumpet, and show the Lord's people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins, in this attempt against good and lawful government. The pulpit of this day should emulate the pulpit of former times in every country where Presbyterianism has had a name, just to the extent and degree that there may be just occasion for it, in any place, or in any branch of the church. And church courts should follow the noble example set them by the Church of Scotland, and by our own church in days gone by; while enjoining upon all, obedience to the lawful government as a religious duty, and denouncing treason and rebellion as sins against God and man, vindicating at the same time the rights of the pulpit, bringing traitors to justice, and visiting upon them deposition and excommunication. When her tribunals shall do this, the church will deserve the respect of men and enjoy the approbation of God. The pulpit, in these times of peril, need not shun the fiery eloquence of Davies. If his commission was not sullied by his thrilling appeals for loyalty to the government, and for support to its military arm, the commission of no man need be. It should ring out with the clarion notes of Stiles, and Langdon, and Chauncey, and Mayhew, and a host of their coadjutors. It may imitate the boldness of Knox, and Davidson, and the Melvilles. The small men of the present day need not fear to follow where these intellectual and theological giants have led the way. The path which they have trodden, is one of honor, of piety, of duty, and of safety. But how is it with the men of these times? Ministers even in the loyal states, some of them occupying prominent pulpits in our largest cities, when they find it not safe openly to advocate secession, treason, and rebellion, will palliate, extenuate, and excuse them; while others, apparently not daring to go quite so far, will declaim against the horrors of fratricidal

war—and they are terrible enough, as we all too well and painfully know—and will define their own positions in subtle and abstract phrases of convenient construction, and studiously avoid even to pray for the success of the government in putting down rebellion, but will so mince their prayers that they embrace its foes as well; and while still another class, fall back upon and bring out all their logic and lore in an attempt to maintain the position, that this is a subject which the pulpit and church courts must not touch, that it is beyond the province of their proper functions—a proposition which has no solid basis or countenance from truth, human or divine, and which is utterly abhorrent to the readiest and best instincts of the human soul. What! Must society be heaved to its utmost depths, and every interest affecting church and state be imperiled, relating to our moral, social, and religious, as well as our civil welfare, in a country such as ours, and with such a government as ours, a government of *the people*; and must this terrific struggle for and against our NATIONAL LIFE, fill the anxieties of the day and the visions of the night of men of all classes, calling our young men to the battle-field from their workshops and plows, their professions and counting-rooms, from the halls of our colleges and the communion table of our churches; and yet, when all are so enlisted to save the heritage of freedom and self-government which has come down to us from our fathers through a fiery ordeal and a baptism of blood, and when the nations of the whole world and the church of all lands are watching the scene with an interest never before awakened in any cause since nations arose or the church was founded,—must the CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD in this very land, her pulpits and her courts, be the *only place* and they the *only people* on all the broad earth, where men are idle spectators—reverend and grave, sanctimonious and dumb!

Thanks be to kind Heaven, we do not so read her charter, either in the records of God's truth or in the light of her own history. But we say fearlessly, it were better that God should sweep her with the fires of persecution—aye, with the besom of destruction—and raise up a generation that would read and expound his word aright, and teach men their civil, social, and religious duties, as he has solemnly bidden them, than that those engaged in treason, rebellion, and schism, should obtain

“aid and comfort” from even the silence of the church, in the face of the plainest demands of God’s word and providence, in this most wicked and causeless attempt to overthrow good government which has ever been made since the rebellion of “the angels which kept not their first estate.”

ART. V.—*Credibility of the Resurrection of the Dead.*

THE Bible affirms—does reason corroborate?—that “the dead shall be raised incorruptible,”—that “there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust,”—that “the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God and shall come forth.” “No,” says an objector, “Reason does not corroborate, but controverts it, and challenges it as *incredible*.” And, from the age of the apostles till now, sceptics have not failed to reiterate this Saduceean charge of incredibility against this fundamental doctrine of the Christian system; and even among those who profess to recognize the Bible as God’s Word, in a general sense, are found some of the most zealous antagonists to the truth of this doctrine. The plain asseverations of the Bible are not sufficient to convince; and hence they are either explained away, or directly contradicted.

Reason here is supreme; God’s Word is constrained to succumb—for it is assumed that the one stands opposed to the other. But is it so? Is our faith in the destined resurrection of the dead founded exclusively in the arbitrary declarations of the Bible? Must we cease to be rational while we exercise credence in this article of our religious faith? We accept the appeal to the designated tribunal of reason. And we are happy to feel assured that no true doctrine of Divine Revelation can suffer by being carried up to this tribunal. God has endowed us, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, with certain rational faculties, by which we are capacitated to entertain the momentous problem, “What is truth?” and to acquire such solutions of it as suffice for all important practical uses,

if they do not put us in actual possession of absolute science. And *that* God who has thus benevolently endowed us is the Author of all truth, whether natural or supernatural—whether in the Bible, or in creation: and truth is ever consistent with the character of its Author, and hence, necessarily also, always consistent with itself, wherever it may be found, or by whatever means it may be made manifest. Therefore, truth in God's Word will be truth in God's works, and before the eyes of universal reason, whether of God, angels, or men.

Let reason, then—not ignorant, benighted, prejudiced, blind reason—but enlightened, candid, honest, thoughtful, pious reason, for the time being, sit in judgment upon the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and award its final decision according to the principles of evidence and its own divine constitution. But let it be distinctly understood, in the outset, that the question which reason is now to consider and dispose of by its rational investigation, is not whether the light of nature, independently of revelation, would suffice to make known to us, and prove this wonderful and mysterious doctrine of the Christian's creed; or whether, after it has been communicated through the medium of God's Word, we can dispense with all aid derived from this source, and upon mere principles of philosophy, in the interpretation of facts and phenomena observable in nature, assure ourselves that this doctrine is not a doctrine of revealed religion only, but of natural religion also. But the question is this—the same which the Apostle Paul addressed to the rational consideration of the skeptics of his day: "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" It is simply a question of the credibility or incredibility of a doctrine, for the knowledge of which we are exclusively indebted to divine teaching. The Word of God affirms this doctrine, clearly, unequivocally; the Christian Church has incorporated it in the cardinal articles of her faith, and millions of Christians rejoice in the full persuasion of its truth; but notwithstanding all this, is the doctrine false, and the faith exercised in it a delusion? What are the grounds upon which infidel reason assumes to predicate of the Resurrection of the Dead that it is incredible—beyond the sphere of legitimate

human belief? Let us endeavor to ascertain these grounds, and at the same time test their merits.

I. Is this doctrine incredible because of God's want of power to accomplish the event concerned?

Is not God omnipotent? Is there any limit to his power, save that which his own perfections establish, which render him incapable of doing anything that may conflict with his wisdom, justice, holiness, goodness, and truth? Has he not equal power to raise the body from its dead, decaying, and even long-dissolved condition, as he had to produce it originally from nonentity? Is it any more inconsistent with reason to affirm that "the dead shall be raised incorruptible," than it is to affirm that in the beginning God made man, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul? that at a certain period in the evolutions of eternity the human race, which had no antecedent existence whatever, were ushered into being, and endowed with immortality? Does not the fact of man's present existence, as consisting of body and soul intimately united, and mutually dependent and co-operating, furnish a fact as incredible in its intrinsic, essential nature—a fact as wonderful, and mysterious, and incomprehensible to human intellect, and as far removed from the reach of its adequate conception as the fact that God shall raise the dead? Shall we, for a moment, harbor the suspicion that he, by whom all worlds consist—by whom the earth on which we tread, and whose atmosphere we breathe; from whose gurgling fountains we allay our thirst, and by whose bounteous fruits, furnished us in such varied forms, and in such luxuriant harvests, we are nourished; whose every mountain, hill, and valley; whose every ocean, lake, and river; whose every bird, beast, fish, and insect; whose every tree, shrub, and blade of grass; whose every pebble upon the seashore, and radiant flower upon the plain; all attest Divine omnipotence;—shall we, for a moment, harbor the suspicion that the power of God is insufficient to achieve the resurrection of the dead? We can not; we dare not.

Therefore, the charge of incredibility against this doctrine is invalid, upon the ground of the want of Divine power.

II. Is this doctrine incredible, because of the difficulty or

impracticability of the mind's comprehending the manner in which the event taught by it shall be accomplished?

We hear an objector say, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" And as the *how* precisely is not fully revealed or made intelligible to him, he chooses to reject the whole as essentially chimerical. How does Paul respond to such an objector? "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare (or mere) grain; it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed its own body." As much as to say, here is a fact you can not deny, and a mystery you can not comprehend, analogous to the resurrection of the dead; will you—can you, in the face of your familiar observation to the contrary, pronounce it—in the advance of the result—incredible that the seed which is planted in the earth, shall, after a species of death and corruption, put forth and produce a body which God will give it—its own body; that it shall issue from its place of burial to a new and higher life than that which it sustained before, and so as that the body produced from it can be traced back to the body from which it sprung in such a way as to constitute a vegetable identity between them? Can you solve this familiar mystery in the vegetable kingdom? Can you comprehend it, and denude it of its inherent mystery? You can not. Divine power is here, and nothing less. Man may sow the seed, but man can not give it growth. It is God that accomplishes this result, and certainly the accomplished fact is proof of the accomplishing ability, although no formula of science may enable us to penetrate the arcana of the fact, or grasp of intellect sufficient to seize all its inexplicable phenomena.

But what event in nature would not be incredible—absolutely incredible—if the only condition upon which it could be believed were that it should first be reduced to the level of the comprehension of the human understanding? On such terms we could not credit our own existence. Therefore, to affirm that, on this account, the resurrection of the dead is incredible, is to affirm that in our disposal of this doctrine we should contravene all the laws of ordinary human belief, and belie the constitution of our mental and moral nature; and

hence, the mere incomprehensibility of the event concerned does not justify the charge of incredibility against it.

III. Is this doctrine incredible, because of the essential antagonism between matter and spirit; matter being essentially and eternally evil, and spirit being a divine emanation, whose destiny is to be delivered from all alliance with matter, and restored to the Divine Essence to be reabsorbed in the great ocean of his infinite Self-existence forever?

To develop and explain this ground of the assumed incredibility would require us to enter into what would be rather an uninteresting and unprofitable, though curious detail of the cosmogony of the ancient Oriental and Grecian philosophers, who maintained that there were "universally two eternal, original principles, God and self-existent matter, neither of which is the foundation of the other. The former they supposed to be a rational and thinking principle, and the author of all good; the other, irrational and unintelligent, and the author of all evil." This theory, in its application to the origin of the world and of man's compound being, invaded the church at a very early day, and is still believed, in the name of Christ, by some of those who profess to be his disciples, and who, by a forced and ingenious exegesis of God's Word, reject its literal and common sense import, and accommodate its teachings to their preconceived and peculiar opinions.

The palpable absurdity of this theory of Oriental schools is a sufficient rejoinder to the charge of incredibility against the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead on this account.

IV. Is this doctrine incredible, because of contradictory events which it involves, like that of causing to be and not to be at the same time?

This, we presume, is the special and main ground upon which it is predicated that no evidence can suffice to make it reasonable to credit the rising of the dead. It is said that the future resurrection of the *same* bodies is "intrinsically inconceivable and incredible." Mark the expression, "the *same* bodies." The author of this declaration (Bush) inculcates the doctrine of a resurrection *from* the dead—not *of* the dead—by the elimination of a spiritual body from the material body in the event of death; and this, he maintains, by a

most specious, but arbitrary and constrained system of argumentation, to be the doctrine of God's Word upon this subject.

You perceive that the point of difficulty does not consist in the simple resurrection of the bodies, but of the *same* bodies. "With what body do they come?" asks the objector; indicating by his interrogatory, that it certainly can not be with the same bodies. Thus he settles down in the persuasion that it is demonstrated, by the very nature of the case, that the resurrection of the dead "is inconceivable and incredible."

But we rejoin: That is the very thing to be proven, and not taken for granted. The question is, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?"—not separate a living principle *from* the dead, but *raise the dead*. And what is it of man that dies? Not the soul or spirit, but the body. And if "the *dead* shall be raised incorruptible," as is affirmed in the Word of God, and the *bodies* of men only die, should we not understand God's Word as affirming that the *dead bodies* of men shall be the subject of a resurrection?

But these bodies, immediately subsequent to death, undergo decomposition—"the dust returns to the earth as it was"—and their elements enter into other organic or inorganic alliances—it may be, to some extent, become constituent parts of other living bodies; and it is not absurd to presume that the material elements, which entered into the organization of the bodies of the first men who fell victims of mortality thousands of years ago, have sustained organic connection, as constituent elements, with thousands of other human bodies since their day.

How, therefore, it is asked, can the same bodies ever be raised from the dead? To suppose such an event possible is to suppose that bodies *can be* and *not be* possessed of the same constituent elements at one and the same time, which is a palpable contradiction, and therefore beyond even Divine power to effect. The conclusion deduced follows infallibly from the premises laid down, that the resurrection of the dead is clearly impossible, and the objector seems, at last, to have demonstrated his charge of incredibility.

But the premises—are they correct? Sound logic can reach

false conclusions only from false premises. Whether these are true or false, therefore, it is all-important to ascertain before we proceed to build an argument upon them, and to deduce our corollaries. All our reasoning, however well-sustained and beautifully concatenated, must be utterly abortive in the search of truth or exposure of error, if it sets out with a false major proposition.

We deny the correctness of the premises assumed, and hence we regard the conclusion as invalidated by this fact. It is not essential to the resurrection of the dead bodies, that the risen bodies should be constituted of precisely the same material elements with the mortal bodies which they represent, in order that we may be justified in believing the scripture doctrine of the resurrection. It is *his own body* which God promises to confer upon every soul of man, in the event of the resurrection—*his own body* in distinction from *the body of another*; and in this *proprietorship*—whatever may be the essence of it—consists the peculiar relationship between the mortal and immortal bodies—the bodies dead and the bodies risen. And this proprietorship is a felt-proprietorship inhering in the consciousness of each individual soul of man, so that, as in the present life, through the successive periods of it, man is always assured that he is possessed of his own body in distinction from that of another, it shall be also his own body which the resurrection will rescue from the state of the dead, as the future immortal organism of his immortal soul. It will therefore be a sameness or identity of proprietorship; and this sameness or identity, consciously perpetuated through continued changes and periods of time, does not consist in the sameness or identity of the inert, passive materials of the body, but in the living, active principle of the body, the soul. The man-proper is not the body, but the soul, for man was not man till he received the breath of life, and then, it is written, “man became a living soul.”

Upon this principle, no contradiction is involved in the event of the resurrection of the dead, any more than in the actual continuing of the existence of the same body from one moment to another on earth, in midst of the incessant flux and reflux of material particles which enter into and pass away from its ever-changing constituency. The sameness—the

identity—is in the soul—is a personal identity, a *felt personal identity*, which pervades the whole compound being of man in his compound state, whether antecedent to death or subsequent to the resurrection.

V. But whether we shall regard it as credible or incredible that God should raise the dead, is so dependent upon the particular conception we may form of the nature of the *sameness* or *identity* in question, that our chief attention, in this discussion, will be devoted to an attempt to develop and elucidate the true idea of the identity involved. It is a subject of acknowledged difficulty, and one which it was well worthy of the cultivated analytical powers of the great Butler to reduce from incomprehensible mystery to the light of intelligibility. Mystery still cleaves to it, however, and always must, just as essential mystery envelops and pervades every work of the Glorious Deity. But its mystery is not such as to justify us in rejecting its truth, or in failing to apprehend it as truth, by the understanding.

That a recognized relationship is destined to subsist between the dead and the raised bodies, sufficient to justify the predication of a species of sameness or identity between them, is an inevitable inference from the language employed by the Scriptures in the presentation of this subject. But observe, we say a *species* of sameness or identity. Now, the question is, what is that species? In what does its specific nature consist? How may it be clearly and satisfactorily defined and explained? To solve this problem is the task we are now about to undertake. And as preparatory to this solution, we will first consider in what senses the dead and the raised bodies are not the same, or wherein their identity does not consist.

1. Their sameness or identity *does not consist* in their being distinguished by the same peculiar attributes; for in this respect they are not identical, but are as variant from each other as light from darkness, life from death; or rather, we should say, as glory from vileness, power from weakness, incorruption from corruptibility, immortality from mortality. Yes, the risen body—especially of such as have part in the first resurrection—is essentially different from and superior to the dead body in its peculiar properties.

Thus God's Word teaches. Paul, in his epistle to the Phil-

ippians (iii: 20, 21), speaking of the present life and future destination of Christians, says, "Our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." The second coming of the Lord is here referred to by the apostle, in which event the resurrection of the dead will be effected; and then it is that these our now vile bodies shall be *changed*—shall be purified from all their vileness, and shall be made glorious after the manner of Christ's glorious body.

Again, says the apostle in his epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv: 43, 44), "It—that is, the dead body—is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." Further, he says (same chap., 52, 53), "The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, * * * for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."

Thus while revelation carefully retains the idea of an identity subsisting between the dead and the risen bodies, it likewise, with equal care, assures us that this identity does not consist in an identity of attributes. The object of our search, therefore, must be sought elsewhere, for we have not found, and can not find it here.

2. Still further, their identity *does not consist* in their being constituted of the same identical particles of matter. How abundantly this is both proven and illustrated by the consciousness of every living man in his present body! It is a matter of fact too well ascertained to be denied, that our bodies, while performing the ordinary functions of life, are continually undergoing changes in their material consistency—that really no two successive moments find this constituency precisely the same. In every inhalation of the lungs, in the common act of breathing, we receive material elements into union with our physical organisms, so that these elements become constituent parts of said organisms, and contribute to nourish and sustain them; and at the same time, we give out or exhale into the air, material particles which had sustained a

living union with our bodies up to this moment, but now are returned to the great reservoir of nature to fulfill another mission there. Food and drink taken into the body, in answer to the imperious demands of hunger and thirst, are assimilated, by a most wonderful and benevolent process, to all the varied and complex organs and tissues of our most fearfully and wonderfully made bodies, so as promptly to supply the place of effete particles carried away, and thus keep up the integrity of every bone, and muscle, and nerve, and sinew, and membrane, as long as a healthy life is sustained.

There is an incessant pulling down and building up of our physical systems—a transferring of material elements, some being removed and others being substituted in their stead—a constant *resurrection from the dead, and of the dead*, as it were, exemplified in our daily experience. There is no fact in nature with which we are more conversant than this. We are living and dying, dying and living at every breath. We are passing from old to new bodies every instant of time.

And yet there is a felt identity between the old and the new body—between the body of the moment before and that of the moment after—yea, between the body of the child, which has not yet encountered the vicissitudes of this life for a single hour, and the body of the frail, trembling, paralytic patriarch, eighty years afterward, bending into the grave. But certainly, it is not an identity of material elements, nor an identity growing out of, or resulting from, matter at all in any of the peculiar arrangements it may assume as the temporary tabernacle of the soul.

3. We go further, and say that there is reason to presume that the material constituency of the raised body must vary from that of the dead or mortal body; else the change of attributes by which the former is distinguished from the latter would be impracticable without a change in the essential properties of matter.

The whole number of material elements supposed to enter into the constitution of the human body has been estimated at about sixteen. This is the maximum estimate. Chemists have hitherto been able to detect but sixty-six primary elements in all nature, and comparatively few of these are the basis of all nature's phenomena. Into the human body these

elements are received chiefly as proximate elements—that is, as elements in composition.

But material elements have certain invariable properties by which they are distinguished, and when certain known elements enter into certain known combinations, whether by the chemistry of mere elective affinities, or by that chemistry which inheres in the mysterious principle called *vital force*, their properties, or, in other words, their phenomena will be invariable. Therefore, if the constituency of the risen body is to be precisely the same, in its elemental structure, with the present mortal body, it can not, without the annulling of some, at least, of the essential properties of matter, possess any attributes different from those of its former state. The very conclusion that the risen body is not a vile, weak, corruptible, mortal body, but a glorious, powerful, incorruptible, immortal body, involves the necessity of a change in its material constituency.

Hence, if it is asked, In what does the identity subsisting between the dead and the risen bodies consist? we answer, *first*, not in their being possessed of the same distinguishing properties; and *second*, not in their being constituted of the same material elements.

4. In what, then, does this identity consist—not negatively, but affirmatively? Can we tell? Perhaps it may be denied that there is any such thing as identity predicable of man in the different periods of his earthly history. If so, our consciousness will belie the denial. We feel—we know that we are the same through all the vicissitudes of this life, and through all periods of it. We may not be able to furnish any philosophical explanation of it, but the fact is a fact of experience, and this suffices to assure us that it is a fact, whether we can explain it or not. It is testified to by the instinctive, involuntary consciousness of our being, and no sane man will refuse to trust in the evidence of his consciousness.

But this identity is not felt by us to consist in a particular identity of material constituency and organization of the body, through all the periods of its waste and repair, its growth and decline. Indeed, according to our consciousness, it does not *inhere* at all in the body as a whole, nor in its parts; and yet

it does in some way still attach to the body. But not to the body as composed of certain material elements to the exclusion of others, and as having certain proportions and harmonies of form, and certain temperaments, and susceptibilities and powers in distinction from others, but to the body simply and wholly as *our own body and not the body of another*.

This, therefore, we infer, is the essence of bodily identity. It is an identity resulting from the soul proprietorship; and the voice of consciousness which attests its existence, is the voice, not of the body in whole or in part, but of the proper person of man, the soul—the living, thinking, reasoning and conscious principle within—saying through all periods and conditions of the compound being of said person, whether before or after the resurrection: this body is my own true, proper body—a part of my compound self; for God gives to every soul, as to every seed, his own body.

This is the only identity which can be truly predicated of the continued relationship of the human body to itself through the different periods of its mortal life—an identity subsisting really in the soul, and predicable of the body only in so far as it is the soul's own body, and not the body of another. And this identity will reach beyond the grave, and extend throughout eternity as easily and as certainly as from one moment to another in time.

VI. Let analogies come to our aid for argument and illustration. Paul has given us an example of an analogy, to which we have already referred, and which he employed with skill and force in reply to a certain objector, who said, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" "Thou fool," said Paul, "that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body." In commenting on this passage, Dr. Candlish remarks, in his *Life in a Risen Saviour*: "You sow the seed with a view to its being quickened and living. But you sow it in the full knowledge that it can be quickened and can live, only by its undergoing a process of death, decay and dissolution. That

is the condition of its being quickened and living. And the process which it must undergo is such as to change its whole nature and character; and so to change it, that what springs up is something altogether new—‘thou sowest not that body that shall be.’ What you sow is ‘bare grain;’ it is ‘the mere seed of wheat, or some other kind of corn.’ What comes up has a very different material or corporeal structure and organization from that which the ‘bare grain’ you sow possesses. What sort of body it is that is to come up depends on the sovereign will of the great Husbandman. ‘God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him.’ But whatever change there may be, identity is not, in any wise, to be lost; for there is to ‘every seed his own body.’”

And in immediate connection with this analogy from the natural world, Paul employs several others, all contributing to the same result—to show that it is not incredible that God should raise the dead, and that the connection, involving identity, which the common faith of Christians accept as destined to subsist between the dead and the risen bodies, is a connection the bonds of which are in the life or soul by which these bodies respectively are animated, and not in the inert, unconscious matter which may at any time sustain an organic union with said life or soul. And what is there in this that is “intrinsically inconceivable and incredible?” What is there in this that does not accord with the lifetime experience and intuitive convictions of every intelligent creature?

VII. But we propose another analogy, after the manner of Paul, for argument and illustration, derived from the vegetable kingdom.

1. Suppose we have an acorn in our hand. It is the seed of an oak. But how different in aspect from the parent tree! Who would ever suspect, from any visible indications, that there was any relationship between them! They sustain not the slightest apparent similitudes to each other, and yet their internal nature is the same. The oak is in the tree, and in the acorn alike; but the tree is not an acorn, nor the acorn a tree. But both are visible and peculiar manifestations of the oak. What a mystery, and what a power are confined—shut up within the pale of the narrow cup of the one; and what a no greater mystery and power are developed through the

huge trunk, and gnarled branches, and rich sinuate foliage of the other!

“The pulpy acorn, ere it swells, contains
The oak's vast branches in its milky veins,
Each ravell'd bud, fine film and fibre line
Trac'd with nice pencil, in its small design.”

We contemplate the acorn. It is a living, vegetable existence, and that living vegetable existence is *an oak*. The vital force—the mysterious, incomprehensible, vital force present in the acorn, and which endows it as a living seed, is the same vital force which subsequently pervades the tree that proceeds from it, and which endows it, not as a living tree only, but as a living *oak* tree. But in what does this vital force consist? Can we dissect or analyze it? Can we subject it to experimental observation by the aid of the microscope, or trace out its occult elements by any means within our power? We can not. It is a hidden, mysterious, wonder-working power, of the effects of which alone we are privileged to become cognizant. Itself evades our most searching scrutiny.

2. We take the acorn and plant it in the earth, in suitable conditions for vegetation and growth. If the vital force be not present in the seed, the acorn will very soon be dissolved and entirely disappear without any vegetable or organized product whatever resulting from it. But upon the supposition that it is a living acorn—that the vitality of the oak pervades it, we will soon discover that the homogeneous mass of the seed is assuming a new aspect—that the material elements are assuming new arrangements, and a plant is developed. The *radicle* sends forth its little branches to sieze upon the soil, and the *plume* looks upward to the air and the sun. The seed has been absorbed as nourishment by the embryo, and having fulfilled its peculiar mission, is not perpetuated. Now instead of the acorn, we have the infant tree in the form of a little plant, and that plant is an oak-plant; and it is an oak-plant, not by virtue of the mere relations and properties of the material elements which enter into its organic structure and form, but by virtue of the *oak-life* which pervades it, and in which the organic potency of its being subsists. Soon the plant becomes a shrub, the tree in its childhood, and that shrub is an oak-shrub, for the same oak-life which pervaded the smaller

growth of the plant, pervades the larger development of the shrub. But from the earth and the air, through the instrumentality of its roots and its leaves, it receives new accessions of material constituents continually to its vegetable organic structure, and increases daily in magnitude, until, in the progress of centuries, it becomes the monarch of the woods. But at no point of time in all this progressive development, from its first germination up to its now majestic proportions, running through a period of hundreds of years, has it ever ceased to be the same identical oak, of which the seed, the plant, the shrub, and the tree, are but the body in various stages of development. And in the meanwhile what a flux and reflux of material constituency have transpired in the structure and composition of this body of the oak! Through no two successive moments of all this extent of time of the oak's existence and development, have the material particles in union with its organic body been precisely the same. And yet the identity of the oak remains inviolate, in the midst of all these material changes—this incessant waste and repair of its material embodiment. We contemplate the tree, now towering high in the might of its majesty, and suppose we are familiar with its history. Five hundred years ago, we say, a certain man planted this tree. In common language we say, he planted *the tree*; but literally, he did not plant the tree, but the *acorn*, and the tree was long subsequent to the planting. More accurately speaking, he planted the *oak*, *then* an acorn, *now* a tree; and the oak, subsisting in and manifested through this tree, is the *same identical oak*, which was planted nearly half a millennium since. To maintain that the identity here acknowledged is dependent on and the result of the continuity of the same material elements as entering into the same material organs and organization, and as performing the same physical or vegetable functions, is at variance with common understanding. There is no such identity nor can there be. And yet we are sure there is what we recognize as an identity. But it is an identity more grand and sublime than that which is the result of mere material organism—an identity growing out of, and dependent on, the continuity of the same vital force—the *oak-life*—which is the efficient *created cause*, subordinate to the primary *creative cause*, of all the various material

modifications and arrangements, which constitute its organic body. The incipient germination, and all the subsequent growth, have been effected by no mere potency of matter, but by that peculiar, mysterious, inexplicable vegetable life, which constitutes the *oak proper*, in distinction from its material body, the *tree*; so that we can say, with propriety, the tree is but the creature of the oak-life. That is, the vital force is the energizing power which is the immediate efficient cause of the tree, and develops its roots, trunk, branches, foliage, and fruit, and impresses upon it its laws, its phenomena, and its destiny. The tree, therefore, is a development of the life within it, and the life not a development of the tree. Hence it is possible that the life may subsist independently of the tree which it develops, for the cause is always before the effect; the oak-life precedes, in the order of being, the oak-tree, which is the creature of the oak-life. It may be said that a cause can not be a cause, except as productive of an effect—that cause and effect are correlative terms, the one always supposing the other, and therefore that there can be no cause as antecedent to its effect, because separate from an effect it is no cause. This is logically true. But there may be a causal power without a caused effect. The causal power may be latent, for want of the conditions requisite to render it operative; and it is no less really a power on this account. Let the requisite conditions transpire, and the power, drawn forth from its latency, ceases to be merely *causal*, and becomes a *cause* by the production of its appropriate effect. In this case, the causal power is an antecedent principle; the caused effect, a subsequent result. So the life principle in vegetable and in animal organisms, is a *cause* of which the organisms respectively through which it manifests itself, are an *effect*; but this life-principle may, possibly, exist as a *causal power* without the effect which, under certain conditions, it is capable of producing. And if so, is it not possible also that the effect may be destroyed, and the causal power survive the destruction of the effect? And if this power may survive such an event, may it not again, on some future occasion, renew its legitimate effect, and become a cause? The effect is but a contingency, dependent on the cause. Now, for sake of perfecting the analogy, let us suppose the oak-life to be immortal; and this

supposition is not absurd, nor intrinsically inconceivable. It is assumed, therefore, that the oak-life, or soul-principle of the oak-tree, ever lives whatever may befall its bodily organism, the tree. We believe, for the present, the soul-life of the tree to be immortal; just as we are assured the soul-life of the human body is immortal. But notwithstanding such is our faith upon this subject, we see the tree sicken and die, and eventually become uprooted and dissolved, or that not a trace of it is left behind to attest that it ever had an existence. What now becomes of our immortality doctrine? The tree is dead and wasted away, and where is it? Nowhere. But the tree's life-principle—where is it? If that is immortal, it still lives, though not in its material body as heretofore. And it lives, not as a mere principle of life irrespective of its nature, but as oak-life, in distinction from other species of life in the vegetable world, and as its own individual oak-life in distinction from every other life of the same order.

And is it not conceivable, and might it not be credible that this oak-life, in its immortality, might possibly resume its material manifestation in its own oak-body, now dead and decomposed, but then correctly represented as raised from the dead? Let that life be commissioned, as in the acorn, to exercise the prerogative, under Divine appointment, of taking for itself a body—of which it may have been divested for thousands of years—out of the material world, and is it incredible that it can be done? And if this be admitted to be possible, are we obligated to maintain that the resumption of the raised body must be effected first in the form of an acorn; then of a little plant; then of a shrub, and then, after a long period, of a giant tree! And also, must we believe that every particle of the material elements that had ever before entered the organized constituency of the old and dead tree, must find its place in the constituency of the new and risen tree? Neither of these conditions are indispensable. And the tree, thus reassumed by its own oak-life—thus raised from the state of death and dissolution—would infallibly be an *oak-tree*, and not an ash, nor a beech, nor a sycamore—would be the oak's *own true body*, once dead and reduced to an elemental state, now reorganized and made alive by its own *true oak-life*, and henceforth the oak-life and the oak-tree would be one

organic existence, sustaining, through the medium of its life-principle, an identity of being with all the former periods and states of that existence.

3. So man, as a terrestrial animal, is compound in his nature—consists of soul and body. The soul is the tree, self-conscious, active, thinking principle of his nature; the body is the mere material organism of the soul. As long as the soul inhabits the body, so long the body lives, and amid all the physical and constitutional changes of which it may be the subject, never loses its identity as the organism of the same living, indwelling principle. But death comes at length. The soul takes its departure from the body; and as the body exists exclusively for sake of the soul, and by virtue of the soul's vivifying and conserving power, whenever the soul departs, that vital force which had hitherto sustained its vital functions and preserved it from decomposition, is withdrawn, and the body returns to the earth as it was. But the soul does not die. This is immortal. And *this* living, where is the incredibility of the doctrine which teaches that God shall raise the dead?

4. Some seek to relieve this difficulty by looking for the germ of the future body in the dust of the dead body. What ridiculous ideas of this description have been promulged! What is the *germ* of anything but its *life*? Undeveloped life it may be called, but it is no less certainly life. The germ of a plant or an animal is susceptible of being developed with the plant or the animal of which it is the germ, only because the potent life is in the germ. An organic germ is not essential to the subsistence of a life which is immortal in a condition separate from all material organisms, as is the case with the human soul after death. That life *first* subsists, and *then* the germ subsists for the life's sake, while it is no more a part of the life's essence, than is the house which a man inhabits a part of the essence of its inhabitant. The true living germ is not a mere aggregation nor chemical combination of certain material elements sustaining certain peculiar modes and forms of organization, but it is a potent life, which, in dwelling in certain definite forms of matter, develops potentially a continued and growing organization, and other phenomena of organic existence, through the instrumentality and medium of these definite and peculiar forms.

Hence we affirm that the real germ or life of the future risen body is that which is the germ or life of the present body; namely, the soul. The soul, we say, never dies. It goes to God who gave it, and continues with him for a period. But when that period has elapsed, God will restore to every soul its own body; a body, it may be, organized of other and far more glorious elements than those which entered into the constituency of the dead body, for it will be a far more glorious body; a body far more vigorous and untiring in its capabilities, for it is to inhabit a sphere forever, where there is no night, and where they serve God without ceasing; a body far more in harmony with the character and wants, and far more obedient to the behests of its immortal occupant; for in the future state no redeemed sinner will have occasion to lament that he finds a law in his members warring against the law of his mind; a body freed from all that is gross and offensive as pertaining to it in its present mortal state, and from being a mortal or mere animal body, as dependent upon the temporal resources, and subject to the trials and limitations of this life, shall become a spiritual body subsisting upon resources far above and superior to anything of which we are now able to form any adequate, or even approximate, conception; a body formed anew and of elements adapted to its future and more glorious and felicitous destination, and modified in all its functions, and organs, and properties by the *vital force*—the immortal soul—which is to be its eternal occupant, and for whose sake it is reproduced from the state of death and dissolution—the soul's own true body, once dead, but now alive to die no more forever.

5. Grant the immortality of the soul, and there can be no rational difficulty in granting the resurrection of the body. The credibility of such an event, in view of all the ascertained circumstances in which it is proposed to be effected, is no more preposterous than the credibility of the growth of a grain of wheat which has been sown in the earth for this specific purpose; and the difficulties pertaining to the question of identity between the dead and the risen bodies are no more incomprehensible than the same difficulties pertaining to the same question in regard to the living body through any two successive moments of its existence. If the life remains

unimpaired in the grain of wheat, though it may have been latent for three thousand years, while slumbering in an Egyptian catacomb, yet whenever it is placed in favorable conditions, it will vegetate and produce; and that body, which it will produce, will be infallibly *its own body*, and not the body of another, for God gives it a body as it pleases him, and to every seed its own body.

Thus analogous events in nature, familiar to our daily observation, furnish their silent but effective testimony in vindication of the credibility of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and the charge of incredibility against it fails in every particular. God's Word and God's works harmonize with each other; what the one affirms or teaches, the other corroborates and elucidates. And the mysteries of the one are no greater than the mysteries of the other, and of all mysteries, whether of doctrine or fact, God himself is the chief and most incomprehensible. It would, therefore, be supremely absurd on our part, as rational beings, and on distinctively assumed rational grounds, to repudiate—simply because of its mystery—the clearly enunciated doctrine of God's Word, that “there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust;” that “all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God and shall come forth, they that have done good to a resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to a resurrection of damnation.”

Let God be true, and every man who contravenes his declarations, a liar. His counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure. “The dead shall be raised incorruptible.”

VIII. We conclude with some practical observations addressed to the reader.

1. Are you a Christian? If so, in view of your belief in this wonderful and sublime doctrine pertaining to your future destination, how should you be consecrated to the Divine service and glory, by all the capabilities with which, as a compound being, you have been endowed? Can it suffice for you to render to the Lord a mere bodily service, or a mere soul service?—to separate between your soul and body in obeying God's will?—to reserve the one for sensual uses, while the other only is consecrated to Jehovah? No; your obligation is to glorify God in your body and in your spirit which are

God's. "Let not sin reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof; neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin, but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God;" for the body, as well as the soul, has been redeemed from death by him who is the resurrection and the life. "I beseech you, brethren," says Paul, "by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." Observe, it is "present your bodies a *living* sacrifice;" that is, with all their living powers, whether of thought, reason, judgment, imagination, memory, will, art of speech, art of writing, power to execute any purpose or achieve any deed which the soul may will and decree to be executed or achieved through the instrumentality of the members, or muscular powers, of the body which it inhabits and endows as a *living* body.

This is, indeed, your reasonable service; for your bodies and spirits are not your own—they have been bought with a price—they are the Lord's. They are the Lord's by original creation, and they are the Lord's also by the purchase of the Messiah. "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, * * but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot." And it is by virtue of this redemption, and the grace obtained through it, that Christians, in the immediate prospect of dissolution, are privileged to exclaim, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law, but thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ;" and again, "Death is swallowed up in victory." Christ died that we might live, and "he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." Yes, *rose again*. Christ "was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." He rose in demonstration of the Divine power to raise the dead, and as an earnest of the fact that the dead shall be raised incorruptible. For you to live, therefore, should be Christ. The life you now live in the flesh, you should live

by the faith of the Son of God, who loved you and gave himself for you: and then for you to die will be gain. While in the mortal body, "we know not what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is;" and our vile body shall be changed and fashioned like unto his glorious body.

What manner of persons, therefore, ought you to be, in all holy conversation and godliness, seeing you look for such things! If you are faithful to Him who is the resurrection and the life, and faithful to the interests of your immortal destination, as involving both the corporeal and spiritual elements of your being, then shall you be of the happy and glorious multitude who shall rise in Christ, and as thus restored to the full integrity of your being, you will be exalted at God's right hand where there are pleasures forevermore.

2. Are you an unbeliever? How does the credibility of this doctrine of the resurrection of the dead appeal to you for your consideration? I say *credibility*—not incontrovertible, demonstrated truth—but *mere credibility*. Let it be admitted that it is possibly, and only *possibly* true, that there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust, and is not the unbeliever utterly inexcusable, who refuses or delays to take the subject into immediate and earnest thought and investigation, that he may be assured beyond a reasonable doubt that the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is not incredible, before he settles down, contentedly, into the rank of an unbeliever? For if this doctrine be true, it is of infinite moment that he should believe it; and if by reason of indifference, or incorrigible indolence, or mental and moral perversity, he should disbelieve, his error will be a fatal one. There is no doctrine more distinctly enunciated in God's Word, and no doctrine more significant and indispensable in its place, to the completeness of that faith which works by love, purifies the heart, and overcomes the world, than this of the resurrection of the dead. It is even an essential part of the Gospel—the glad tidings of great joy which shall be to all people. "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yes, and we are

found false witnesses for God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not." 1 Cor. xv: 13-15.

And hear, once more, the Saviour's own declaration upon this subject: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice (the voice of the Son of God), and shall come forth, *they that have done good to a resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to a resurrection of damnation.*" What a glorious destination for the one! and what a fearful destination for the other! and all depending upon the simple exercise or non-exercise of faith in Christ, and in what he has done and is doing for man's salvation. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned."

But do you insist upon it that it is incredible that God should raise the dead? Are you resolved, at all hazards, to abide in your unbelief of this doctrine, so fundamental in the Christian's creed, and so essential to the perfection of the Christian's hopes? Or will you accept the truth that as "by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead?" And if so, will you not, at once, come to Christ who has said, "I am the resurrection and the life; whosoever believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection"—that is, the resurrection in Christ. Oh, then, while it is called to-day, will you not hear the voice of the Saviour, and not harden your hearts?

3. The period is rapidly approaching to every mortal on earth, whether believer or unbeliever, when he shall be called to contend with his last earthly enemy, the issue of which will be that he will either conquer or be conquered. And none shall conquer who do not conquer in Christ; and none who put their trust in this blessed Saviour will ever be forsaken and left to contend in his own strength, in this the most dread hour of his earthly extremities. And after death comes the judgment, when the believer shall stand forever acquitted, through the righteousness of Christ and sanctification of the Spirit, and shall enter into the joy of the Lord forever.

But how will it fare with the unbeliever in that event?

Where shall the ungodly and sinner appear? How shall he, then and there, answer for the deeds done in the body, without the righteousness of a surety to cover his transgressions? What will be his prospects, in view of the destined resurrection of his body, since that body was the partner of his unbelieving soul in the rejection of the only Name which had ever been given under heaven among men, whereby he could have been saved?

The death-bed and the grave are full of admonition to us all, to work while it is called to-day—to give all diligence to make our calling and election sure, so that when we come to lie upon the one and be buried in the other, we shall rest in the assurance of a future and glorious resurrection. And in times like these, when civil war is rapidly converting our land into an aceldama, and when every household is a household of mourning—when death by disease and death by violence—death in our quiet homes, and death amid the noise, and tumult, and bloodshed of the battle-fields are cutting down the old and the young, the weak and the strong, and all our earthly foundations are trembling with the throes of dissolution beneath us, how important, unspeakably important, to have our peace made with God, and our life bound up in the bundle of life with Christ Jesus, so that whether we live or die, we shall be the Lord's, and with Job may be enabled to say, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold and not another; though my reins be consumed within me."

ART. V.—*The New Life of the Redeemed.* PART I.

THAT God is himself the chief and ultimate end of all things, is a truth taught in the Holy Scriptures with a clearness and directness of statement, that it is something worse than folly to deny it; and reason, no less than Scripture, affirms that

it is right for God to seek the glory of his own name in all his works and ways; but far the mightiest and most wonderful of all God's strange works, is the redemption of the world by Jesus Christ. It is *the* means, in each and all of its parts and results, whereby he is pleased to glorify himself before the face of the universe. It is the crowning act of infinite power and wisdom and goodness. It is the chief of the ways of God. His stately steppings are seen in the sanctuary as nowhere else. If, then, there are things hard to be understood in the natural creation, and in the ordinary providential dealings of God with our race, what awful and unsearchable mysteries may we expect to find in the plan of redemption! Rationalism is as senseless as it is impious. "Without controversy, great is the mystery of Godliness!" It is the mystery of mysteries—a sea of wonders whose depths no human, no angelic line, can sound. It is the divinest of all divine things. It is an infinite conception; in every step of it wrought out by infinite power; in every result of it infinitely wonderful.

The three great parties to be considered in this divine plan of salvation, are God, man, and the Mediator. God is the author, man the subject, and Christ the executive of it. Moreover, as to God he is the last end of it; as to Christ, the end of it is his exaltation to the throne of David and of the universe forever; as to man, the end of it is his everlasting glorification and blessedness in Christ Jesus. The two ends last named are ultimate only so long as we consider the parts and parties of the scheme of grace separately: so soon as we contemplate it in its grand totality, we find them subordinate and subsidiary to the real ultimate and chief end of all, the glory of God. Such is the representation of the Scriptures. At the opening of the Saviour's prayer, recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, he thus addresses the Father: "Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee;" and in Eph. iii: 8-10, Paul, speaking of his own ministry, says, "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all

things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." Glory, and mystery, and unsearchable riches, and the manifold wisdom of God reign throughout the wondrous plan. Glory to God is the chief end—glory through the unsearchable riches, and wisdom, and mystery of it all.

In the person and mediatorial offices of the incarnate Redeemer, in the application of his redemptive work, and in the nature of the New Life imparted thereby to the soul of man, are combined the unsearchable riches of the mystery of redeeming power and love. But these not only stand in the closest and exactest relation to each other, but also follow each other in the order of time and nature as indicated above, and so follow that the last is not simply a sequence, but a consequence, an outgrowth, and hence responsive to the productive forces. The immediate object of the incarnation of the Son of God—the taking of the human into union with the divine—was to impart life to the dead. Now this life, resulting from the union of the soul to Christ by faith, must in its *order*, partake of the nature of that of the Lord of life and glory, who is its author. The condition of its existence and continuance, is union to the son of God by faith in him. He is the head; the church is his body. One life animates the whole. All believers are one in him in virtue of the common life all derive from him; and he and they are one. This life, then, does not bear to its great author, God our Saviour, the simple and single relation of creature to Creator, as the life of plants and animals, or the rational and spiritual life of Adam when first created, or that of holy angels. It is a new creation, indeed, as contrasted with the *old man*; but still it is a life *derived* from Christ, even as the life of sin is derived from Adam. We are "*begotten* again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; * * * being *born* again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." Hence the mystery of the life of the renewed soul, is the adorable mystery of the life of Christ; for it is neither more nor less than the life of Christ in the soul of man. (Gal. ii: 20.) In him are two distinct natures and one *person* forever; and this one living person, the Son of

God incarnate, the God-man, is the primeval source and upholder of life in the once fallen but renewed sons of men. "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." He is the second Adam, the Lord from heaven; and as is he that begetteth, so are they that are begotten of him. Their life is of the same *order*. Herein is found the unity of the mystery of redemption, which begins in the incarnation of the second person of the Godhead and terminates in the glorification of the soul in a perpetual life-union with its mediatorial Head and King, and all to the glory of the divine power, and wisdom, and grace. The mystery of the incarnation passes over in the divine-human life of the redeemed.

The Son of God took into union with himself a true body and a reasonable soul—the man Jesus of Nazareth. But this man never existed as a distinct personality, separate from his union with the Son of God. He never had a life of his own independently of that union, for he never existed but in that ineffable relation, and never will exist otherwise. Our Mediator is neither the Son of God simply, nor the son of man simply; but he is the God-man. So his life is the life not of the Son of God, nor of the son of man, but of the God-man.* We live in virtue of our incorporation with Christ, becoming thereby members of his body. The spiritual life that informs

* When the convicted sinner, enlightened and drawn by the Spirit, turns his eyes to the agonizing sufferer on the cross, he does not coldly inquire, How can the Godhead die? He sees one hanging on a tree, made a curse for him, all human in his sympathies, all divine in his power to save. He does not speculate as to the part the two natures play in the work of atonement. It is *Christ* that dies—that individual person; the innocent for the guilty—his substitute: that is enough for him. Thus we speak of the *life* of Christ. There is no more difficulty in predicating two natures and one life, than two natures and one person. The one life answers to the one person. Look at him as he travels about Galilee, mingling with the people in ordinary intercourse, teaching and working miracles. His is a life perfectly unique, characteristic of him alone. It is distinct from every other order of life. It combines the innocency, gentleness, meekness, affection, dignity, and every other quality of a perfect human nature, with a divine holiness, wisdom, authority, power, goodness, and truth. The beloved disciple, as a familiar friend, leans his head upon the Saviour's bosom, while sacred reverence and awe possess and elevate his soul. "Familiarity operates a kind of apotheosis and the man becomes divinity in simply being known." It is this unique life of Christ, thus manifested to the world which, for want of a better name, we call divine-human.

and impenetrates the rational soul of the redeemed sinner, is the life of the God-man. In this he henceforth lives and moves and has his being. His is no longer simply a rational nature, working according to the primal law of its being, in the way of holiness; but he is filled with the fullness of Christ who is "head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." "And of his fullness have all we received, and grace for grace;" i. e. grace in us answering to grace in him.

In all this, no doubt, there is much transcending our capacity to grasp and explain—much in addition to the thick darkness which veils all life from the gaze of mortals. Known unto God alone are his works. We can know but in part. A great fact is revealed—the incarnation, for instance, or the new life; the rationale of it may be altogether inexplicable to us. The mysteriousness of it, however, so far from constituting a just ground for rejecting it, is a reason for accepting it, provided it be revealed as a fact in Holy Scripture, or is deducible therefrom by good and necessary inference. Our God is a God that doeth wonders; and where shall we look for wonders like those of redeeming grace? that work above all others whereby God is pleased to glorify himself. Let us not, then, turn away from the consideration of this subject, because there may be much in it we can not understand. Perhaps we may discover a great fact revealed, touching the nature of the divine life in the soul of man, that will prove very precious truth in itself, as well as confirmatory and explanatory of other doctrines of divine revelation.

The idea commonly entertained by intelligent Christian people is, that nothing more is involved in the transformation of the soul in redemption than its restoration, when the work of grace and power is completed, to its original sinlessness. This is all, except that it is unchangeably confirmed in holiness; so that henceforth upheld of God, and so upheld that it shall never more fall, it works freely, normally, spontaneously, in the direction of holiness, as it did originally in Adam, and as does the nature of angels who never fell. But is this idea correct? Is this the end of the Divine plan as it terminates on human nature? Is this "the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, *which is Christ in you*, the hope

of glory?" Is the new life only the old life of man in his originally perfect state? We think not. Yet we would rather assume the attitude of earnest inquiry than of dogmatic assertion. The Scriptures appear to us to point to something higher, something far more transcendent, something so stupendous in its kind, that like the incarnation of the Son of God, of which it is the product, no analogy to it shall be found in the illimitable domain of creative power. A new order of being is introduced into the universe, sustaining relations to the Godhead through the incarnation of the Second Person of the Trinity, which exalts it immeasurably above the highest of the heavenly hierarchies.

" *They never sunk so low,
They are not raised so high;
They never knew such depths of woe,
Such heights of majesty.*
The Saviour did not join
Their nature to his own;
For them he shed no blood divine,
Nor breathed a single groan."

The body of the redeemed sinner is not simply restored to the pristine vigor, beauty, and incorruptibility of that part of his complex nature. A loftier destiny awaits it. "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." The body of the raised and glorified saint is not the natural body restored to its primeval perfection. It passes into a higher sphere of existence. It is raised a *spiritual* body. "For our conversation (commonwealth?) is in heaven; from whence also, as Saviour, we wait for the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall transform the body of our humiliation [*so that it be*] conformed to the body of his glory." Phil. iii: 20, 21. What the body of his glory is we are taught by the vision of Peter, and James, and John, on the Mount of transfiguration. They were "eye-witnesses of his majesty," his "honor and glory"—a glory surpassed only by "the excellent glory" from which the voice issued. If the reader will compare, in the original, the passage from Philippians quoted above, the account of the transfiguration in Luke, and Peter's reference to that remarkable event in the first chapter of his second epistle, he will hardly fail to

conclude that in that august transformation of the Saviour's bodily appearance, we have the type of our own in the great day of his second coming. We are "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." When that day comes, the redeemed body of the saved sinner likewise will "shine as the sun." It will assume a glory conformed to that of the highest type of glorified materialism, even the glorified body of the exalted Mediator. Before the spiritual body, all other glories of the material universe will "pale their ineffectual fires." All intelligent beings will wonder and adore, as they gaze upon this crowning exhibition of the glory of God in the glorified body of the redeemed. It will be the sublimest visible work of Almighty power. It will be instinct with a vital energy, with an activity and endurance vastly transcending every other manifestation of physical life. Spiritualized matter, materialized spirit—so ethereal will it be that it shall seem to combine in itself the two substances which comprehend the universe of being.

Now, if the body is the subject of a change so wonderful and glorious, it is altogether congruous that the soul should undergo an analogous change; that it should make an advance in the scale of being all but infinite. Nothing less will adapt it to that ethereal materialism which the plastic hand—not of nature, but of grace and power divine—has molded out of priceless dust, and garnished with imperial splendor for its future and everlasting dwelling-place. Nothing less can be the result of a vital union of the soul to the incarnate Son of God, who is the Lord of life and glory. For, let it be observed, it is a *vital* union. This was not the original relation of the soul of man to God, in Paradise. It could not be. This vital union presupposes the fall, the incarnation, and the drawing of the soul to Christ by the Father, through the Spirit.

The intimate relation constituted by the vital union between the soul and the Godhead, through Christ Jesus, as has already been remarked, exalts it immeasurably above the highest of angelic natures. The paternity of God in their case is grounded in the act of creation; in the case of the redeemed, in the act of begetting. The angels were created by an act of almighty power, energizing itself, so to speak, altogether extrinsic to the great Creator; redeemed sinners are *born* of the Spirit, and,

according to the law of the Spirit of life, being in Christ, the head of descent, as well as covenant, as his spiritual seed. Those are segregated one from the other, having no affiliation by natural descent, and no relation whatever to each other except what springs from a oneness of order; these, with their adorable Head, constitute the *family* of God. Christ, who is also their elder brother, is the only begotten Son of the Father, and they are begotten of the Father through the Son, by the operation of the Spirit, which proceedeth from the Father and the Son. They are all born of the Spirit—born of God.

The purposes of Jehovah in the redemption of men are as various as marvelous. Some of them are obvious on the pages of revelation; others are obscurely hinted at, or revealed only in outline; and others still, no doubt, lie hid in the fathomless depths of the eternal counsels. "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing." It is so in nature, providence, and grace. The scenes of nature lie open to our view, and we can not look around us without beholding, along with the works themselves, the manifold traces of the matchless power, wisdom and goodness, whence they sprang. But there are profound mysteries in nature—mysteries that elude the utmost efforts of philosophy. By a careful induction of particular facts we ascend to general laws; and by a wider generalization we reduce these general laws to one still more general. We advance step by step; but as the light extends, the wider becomes the sphere of surrounding darkness. As knowledge increases, so increases the conviction of ignorance. We catch a glimpse here and there of a fitful ray, penetrating the circumambient gloom; but it is like the lightning's flash—seen and gone. Whichever way we turn, a dark and impenetrable veil circumscribes our view. All above, beneath, around us, is still replete with mystery. We catch a note here and there of the mighty harmonies of nature; but its lofty anthem of praise to Jehovah of Hosts never vibrates on mortal ear. We seize a hint here and a hint there in our investigations, enough to show there is a principle of unity in nature whereby all is bound together, and linked fast to the throne of God; but who can enter her secret chambers and reveal to mortals the primordial law of her being? And then, passing by laws and forces, what do

we know, what can we know of substance? of matter or spirit? A like glorious concealment invests the scheme of Divine Providence. Slowly the complicated drama moves onward, evolving the counsels of the Eternal Mind; yet how small a part of his ways do we understand? At every turn of the mighty wheel on earth who is not ready to exclaim with the prophet Jeremiah, "Righteous art thou, O Lord, when I plead with thee: yet let me talk with thee of thy judgments: Wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper? wherefore are all they happy that deal very treacherously?" Some light, indeed, sufficient for our disciplinary state, beams upon the mysterious course of things from the page of revelation; and where it fails, faith rests in the wisdom, rectitude, and goodness of the Divine Being in the government of the world. Yet, how constantly is the conviction forced upon us, "He maketh darkness pavilions round about him, dark waters, and thick clouds of the skies." Verily, great is the glory of God in concealing a thing! And when we examine the economy of grace and redemption, mingled obscurity and brightness envelop the awful facts revealed to faith. We are expressly informed that the Word, which was in the beginning with God, and was God, was made flesh and dwelt among us. The Second Person of the Godhead became Immanuel, God with us. *His* blood cleanseth from all sin. Yet what unutterable obscurity hangs around the constitution of the person of our Immanuel! The two natures not identified! their respective properties not confounded! yet by their ineffable union constituting the person of the Redeemer of God's elect—at once the brightest glory and the profoundest mystery of the universe! How incomprehensible! What an awful grandeur, what inexplicable wonders, invest the primal fact in the history of redemption! "We delight to lose ourselves in the impenetrable shades which invest the subject, because in the darkness and cloud which envelop it God dwells. It is the greatness which forms the mystery of the fact—the matchless love and condescension constitute the very nucleus of the difficulty. It could only be brought within the sphere of our comprehension by a contraction of its vast dimensions, by a depression of its native grandeur. A prostration of it to the level of our feeble

capacities would only render it incapable of being the magnet of souls, the attraction of hearts, the wonder of the universe.”* Everywhere in the revelations of the great Jehovah, along with that which is necessary to salvation and easy to be understood, are things hard to be understood—too subtile in their nature, too vast in their proportions, to be defined in language or comprehended in thought.

Of the purposes of God in the amazing incarnation of the Son, in his obedience and atoning sacrifice, in his elevation to the mediatorial throne, some, as already stated, are clearly revealed; others, which it by no means concerns us to know now, “the Father hath put in his own power.” Of others we have brief hints, ~~an~~ indefinite outline. It is our privilege to follow these hints, to fill up the outline, so far as the statements and analogies of the word may in any wise warrant. We should not be wise above what is written; but unto that measure we may earnestly strive to attain. In a careful and protracted study of the Divine Word, comparing scripture with scripture, each succeeding generation may add of its inexhaustible riches to the garnered stock of the world’s knowledge. There is a *manifold* wisdom in redemption. In it the divine attributes are harmonized; and not only so: redemption is the harmony of the universe. “The economy of the mystery” is as vast as eternity, and in its influence coextensive with the range of intelligent being. It has relations to other orders of intelligences besides the world of mankind. The intimations of this fact are distinct, whatever sacred reserve may enshroud the subject. The incarnation of the Eternal Son, with its immediate fruits—the great sacrifice for sin and the new life imparted to redeemed humanity—appears to lie at the foundation of the gathering together again in one of all things in Christ. The Captain of salvation, made perfect through suffering in bringing many sons unto glory, is the *causa medians* by which the absolute totality of things is restored to its primal harmony. The glorified Saviour, and the glorified children of the everlasting covenant, made like unto him and placed at the very head of the creation of God, constitute henceforth the connecting link between the

* Robert Hall.

Father of all and the universe of created being. The hypostatical union bridges over the immeasurable gulf between the finite and the infinite, the creature and the Creator. It brings them into an intimacy of relation which no finite mind could have conceived, much less executed. For it would be a very inadequate conception of the truth to regard the hypostatical union as a kind of physical junction. It is not simply a laying of the divine and human in the closest juxta-position possible: it is a life-union. The Eternal Son of God and the man Jesus of Nazareth constitute one person; and all believers in the glorified state are perfectly one with and in this one person. They become "partakers of the divine nature;" or, as perhaps the translation should be, "partakers of *a* divine nature." Now it is because the once corrupt sons of Adam become partakers of a divine nature, through the mediation of Jesus Christ their Head, that they become likewise highest in the scale of being after the Infinite himself. They take rank between the Omnipotent and the thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers in the heavenly places. And here, amid these wonders of divine condescension, grace, and power, we may well point again to the redeemed body, resplendent in the glories of a spiritualized materialism. "To a rational being," says President Dwight, "unacquainted with the existence of either angels or men, pure spirits would seem more likely to be a part of the creation of God, than spirits united to bodies; beings wholly rational, than beings partly rational and partly animal. God is a pure spirit. It is not rationally supposed, that, in creating intelligent beings, he would unite them to matter, in such a manner as to form one being of both matter and mind; but it is rationally supposed, that, delighting as he does in his own manner of existence, he would create beings as much like himself as might be. In creating men, a new difficulty concerning existence, a new mystery of philosophy, is presented to our contemplation, viz.: the union of soul and body, so accomplished as to constitute one percipient being." When the foundations of the earth were laid, and the Almighty Architect spread abroad the heavens and garnished them with beauty, and all nature stood out in the freshness of new-born glories, "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." In the midst of this

magnificent panorama, man, intelligent man, stood proudly eminent, the lord of all. "I will praise thee," says David, "for I am fearfully and wonderfully made." We may well suppose, then, that man was not lost to the view of the heavenly hosts, amid the vastness of the material universe. On the contrary, as he arose from the dust and God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, he became the cynosure of all eyes. All heaven beheld with rapt delight; all hell cast a malignant glance. What ecstatic emotions, then, will thrill the bosoms of these bright sons of the morning, as they gaze again upon the curiously-wrought body of man, now clothed in the beauties of holiness; radiant with the glories of the glorified God-man; dazzling with the brightness that streams from his great white throne; and endued with a divine vigor and immortality! Add to this the knowledge that the spirit which occupies this body is partaker of the divine nature. The convulsions of a dying world; the dissolution and reconstruction of the existing cosmos; the melting of the solid elements with fervent heat; the emergence of the new heavens and the new earth, with other aspects of beauty and magnificence—all this, stupendous as it may be, will attract scarcely a moment's notice. It is but the background of the picture. It is only the stage and its machinery. Jesus and those he brings with him will attract the undivided regard of the universe. "He shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." The mysterious transformation these redeemed ones have undergone, in body and soul, being made like unto him in life and immortality; the matchless dignity among the creatures of God to which they have thereby been exalted: the triumphant manifestation of the economy of grace, in power and glory, as the mighty host gathers and throngs the New Jerusalem, fast by the throne of the Lamb—these are the things which will fill the angelic hierarchies with boundless surprise and admiration. Vast and wonderful indeed will be the change in the framework of nature around them; but how insignificant that in comparison with another that meets their view! The great company which no man can number, with crowns on their heads and palms in their hands!—this will be the wonder of wonders in

the day of wonders—the day of Jesus Christ, for which all other days were made. *He* shall be glorified *in them*.

The preëminence of the redeemed is most manifestly taught in the visions of the apocalyptic seer. The position they occupy in relation to the throne is conclusive. And this is so, whether we confine the representatives of the church to the “four and twenty elders,” to the exclusion of the “four Beasts” (Living Creatures), or include the latter. For if the living creatures, or living ones, denote the attributes of God, or are emblematic of the nature of the divine government, then the elders stand in immediate contiguity to the throne: no angelic order is interposed. If, however, they, together with the elders, symbolize the church, the preëminence of the redeemed becomes still more emphatic. That the latter is the more probable opinion, if not certainly the true one, appears from Rev. v: 8, 9. Let us now examine the visions bearing on the point in question. Ch. iv: 4: “Round about the throne were four and twenty seats (thrones): and upon the seats I saw four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white raiment; and they had on their heads crowns of gold.” Ch. iv: 6: “In the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, were four beasts.” Ch. v: 6: “And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb, as it had been slain.” Ch. vii: 11: “And all the angels stood round about the throne and the elders and the four beasts.”

These scriptures establish the fact, that in the everlasting kingdom of Messiah, redeemed sinners hold the highest rank. And well they may. Their oneness of life with him, their participation in a divine nature, entitle them to it. They are in the midst of the throne and round about it. *All* the angels stand in an exterior circle. Redeemed sinners are made kings and priests unto God. Even as Christ himself is a royal priest and a sacerdotal king, so are they. They “bear the image of the heavenly.” The four and twenty elders sit on as many thrones, clothed in white raiment, and having on their heads crowns of gold. As “in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren,” so the plan of grace is to make them in all things like unto him. And if they are

one with him, it must needs be so. Who, then, of the myriad host of angels could or would dispute preëminence with them.

Here it is in place to offer a suggestion touching the import of the four living creatures of John, which reconciles the two usual interpretations, generically different, and which has an important bearing on the reality of the truth we are endeavoring to establish. The living creatures (unfortunately rendered *beasts* in our translation) are representative of *the divine in the human*—the human being specifically denoted by the four and twenty elders. They are *in the midst* of the throne, *inseparably* connected with it, as well as round about it. The elders are round about the throne, but never said to be in the midst of it. The *Lamb* stands *in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures*, and in the midst of the elders; not in the midst of the throne, and *in the midst of the four living creatures and of the elders*. The throne and the living creatures form an inseparable combination. They are in the midst of the throne, and the throne is in the midst of them; yet they unite with the elders in singing the new song to the Lamb, saying, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests." A like intimate relation subsists between the living creatures of Ezekiel and the throne. (It will be remembered that the word rendered living creature in Ezekiel, and that rendered beast in John, are exact equivalents.) Out of the midst of the symbols of a present Deity, first chapter of Ezekiel, "came the likeness of four living creatures, and they had the likeness of a man." "Their appearance," also, "was like burning coals of fire, and like the appearance of *lamps*: it went up and down among the living creatures; and the fire was bright, and out of the fire went forth lightning." (When Jehovah made a covenant with Abraham in the plain of Mamre, a smoking furnace and a burning *lamp* were his symbols that passed between the pieces of the victims.) Ezekiel also "heard the noise of their wings, like the noise of great waters, as the voice of the Almighty." "And above the firmament that was over their heads, was the likeness of a throne; and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it. From the appearance of his loins even upward, and from the appearance of his

loins even downward, I saw, as it were, the appearance of fire, and it had brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of Jehovah." No attentive reader will fail to be struck with the similarity, or rather identity of the characteristics of the living creatures and the glory of Jehovah. While the latter is upon a throne above the firmament, over the heads of the former, both are girdled alike with the divine fire and brightness; and in both the manhood crops out. "They had the likeness of a man," the glory of Jehovah upon the throne, "the likeness as the appearance of a man." In the former the manhood is more distinct. So in the vision of the cherubim (recorded in the tenth chapter), the sound of whose wings was "as the voice of the Almighty God when he speaketh," "There appeared in the cherubims the form of a man's hand under their wings." Here, too, as in connection with the living creatures of the first chapter, we have the throne of sapphire stone in the firmament above the cherubim, and the glory of Jehovah upon it. But the seventeenth verse appears to identify, beyond all reasonable doubt, these cherubim of the tenth chapter with the living creatures of the first: "For the spirit of the living creature was in them," *i. e.*, in the wheels, which conformed to the movements of the cherubim. And, to make assurance doubly sure, the prophet expressly asserts, in the fifteenth and twentieth verses: "This is the living creature that I saw by the river of Chebar." The reader will also bear in mind the intimate association of cherubim with the Ark of the Covenant, the mercy-seat, and the august symbol of the Divine Presence which rested upon the Mercy-Seat. The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews calls them "cherubim of glory." They were of the same material as the mercy-seat, except the latter was of *pure* gold, they of gold. And, which should not be overlooked, it does seem, notwithstanding sharp criticism to the contrary, that they *were fabricated out of the same mass*; *ex ipsomet operculo*, as the explanatory reading is given in the margin of Michaelis' Hebrew Bible—out of the very cover (mercy-seat) itself. They did not merely rest on the ends of it, but sprang out of them. We do know, Ex. xxxvii: 7, the two cherubim were beaten out of one piece; and if it be objected that that was of gold, while the mercy-seat was of

pure gold, and therefore all could not have been formed out of the same mass, then there must have been a subsequent joining, which gave all the appearance at least of having been formed out of one and the same mass. Nothing less than this will satisfy the fair demands of the sacred record; and this, most probably, was the fact. Compare, in the original, Ex. xxv: 18, 19, with xxxvii: 7, 8. "The cherubim were made out of one piece with the cover" (mercy-seat), says Isaac Leeser, in a brief note on the last verse referred to above. At any rate, there was a real and very close union, not simply a resting of one upon the other. These four—the Ark, the Mercy-Seat, the Cherubim, and the Shekinah resting on the mercy-seat between the cherubim—all closely connected with each other, alone occupied the Holy of Holies. They were the heart, the soul of the Levitical dispensation, and "patterns of things in the heavens." Jehovah dwelt between the cherubim, and they were indissolubly joined to the Propitiatory. The Cloud-Presence rested on the Propitiatory as its throne, while the cherubim, springing out of its ends, stood hard by the Presence, immersed in its rays and reflecting the glory all around.

Now, the conclusion of the whole matter is this: the cherubim of the tabernacle, the living creatures and cherubim of Ezekiel, and the living creatures of John, are all one and the same symbol. They represent the whole company of redeemed sinners in their glorified estate, united in an ineffable and everlasting union to the incarnate Son of God, once slain for them, and afterward exalted to inconceivable majesty and glory on his mediatorial throne—which throne is based on his propitiatory sacrifice; in virtue of which union with him, they become living ones, being partakers of his life, and consequently are sharers of his throne, and invested with a divine energy, power, intelligence, and whatever other attribute in godlike form may be shadowed forth by the cherubic symbolization. That these redeemed sinners are of human kind, is seen in that the living creatures had the likeness of a man, and the hands of a man under their wings on their four sides, and the cherubim the form of a man's hand under their wings; their vast exaltation, in the divinely glorious appearance of both the symbols. In the visions of John, the

association of the four and twenty elders with the living creatures, brings out more distinctly the idea of redeemed humanity—*mankind* as saved—particularly under the two great dispensations of the covenant of grace, after the church militant became a visible, organized body—the kingdom of God on earth. They are round about the throne, not in the midst of it. They are the specific representatives of the fact that redemption proper is of and concerning the human race—that Christ succors not angels, but the seed of Abraham. The living creatures are in the midst of the throne—are resplendent with celestial fire. They are representative of the work of almighty grace and power, completely realized in redeemed and glorified men—the consummation of the life of faith in their perfect life-union in glory with the Lord of glory. These redeemed ones are “angel-like;” nay more, “they are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection.”—Luke xx: 36. Their adoption is now complete. They are partakers of the resurrection. They are partakers of *ἀθανάτεια* of him who alone essentially possesses it—the blessed and only Potentate, who is King of kings and Lord of lords. They are living ones. The life of him who alone hath immortality pervades their being. “For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.” The cherubim and the living creatures, then, are representative neither of the attributes of God in the abstract, nor as manifested in the government of the world, but of the attributes of God as realized and manifested concretely in the glorified persons of saved sinners. Neither are they symbolical of any particular part of the heirs of salvation, while the four and twenty elders are symbolical of another part, nor of them in one estate, and the elders of them in another estate; but both together, elders and living creatures, symbolize the entire company of the redeemed from among men in their risen and glorified estate. They are human still, but the human filled with the divine. It is humanity that is redeemed; but humanity, when the redemption is complete, instinct with the in-being and life of divinity.

Recurring now to a remark already made, we repeat, angels could not and would not dispute preëminence with beings exalted to a peerless dignity by reason of a life-union with

Immanuel, the crowned head of universal nature. They could not, because that pre-eminence stands out supremely manifest and indisputable; they would not, because the rectitude of their nature forbids it. Those holy intelligences see and acknowledge things as they are. Envy and jealousy find no access to their pure spirits. In the exercise of meekness and holy obedience, they go forth now "to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." A joyful band of them directed their flight to the forlorn Lazarus, and conveyed his emancipated spirit to the home of the blessed. "In the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory," and the mighty host of God's elect shall reign in glory with him, in full possession of the great salvation, these lofty and illustrious beings will gladly recognize the fact that the redeemed of the Lord are loftier and more illustrious still than they. The matchless sublimity of that elevation will constitute a prime element in their songs of praise and adoration. But further, it is the express testimony of the Scriptures, that all things, including the angelic orders, were created for Jesus Christ as well as by him. He, Jesus Christ the Mediator, is their last end; and in what sense their last end, we are also told; for all things were created "to the intent that now unto principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." He shall be glorified before them in his saints. And not only so, but we are further informed that the disposition of angels is in perfect accordance with the design of their creation. "Which things the angels desire to look into," says the Apostle Peter. What things? "The sufferings of Christ, and the glory (glories) that should follow." Now connect with this the end of the Saviour's mission, as declared by himself: "I am come that they might have LIFE, and that they might have it *more abundantly*." And the conclusion follows, with absolute certainty, that it is into the glories of this new and abundant life, consequent on the sufferings of Christ, that the angels desire to pry with the intensest curiosity.*

* After the writer of this article had fully excogitated and written out the views presented above, he read, for the first time, the chapter on the Cherubim, in Fairbairn's *Typology of Scripture*. It is scarcely necessary to say he was gratified at finding his own impressions confirmed by the authority of so emi

In attempting to develop thus far the gathering together in one of all things in Christ, through his incarnation and death, his consequent and supreme exaltation, and the exaltation of his covenant seed, now in full possession of a new and divine life communicated from him to them, we have reached the following points: Christ is on the throne; around it, and in immediate contiguity, are the ransomed ones of earth; and then the heavenly hosts, searching, in accordance with the design of God in their creation, into the mysteries of the eternal love, and wisdom, and power, and condescension, and grace of Jehovah, as they all blend and shine with transcendent effulgence in the sons of the resurrection, viz., Christ, "the first-born from the dead," and his brethren, partakers of his sufferings, resurrection, life and immortal glory. But is this condition of things permanent? Will the unfallen angels maintain their primeval integrity? Shall the harmony of the universe be disturbed no more by reason of their defection? Reserving for a future consideration the stability of glorified saints, let us see what light the word of God sheds on the future of these original inhabitants of heaven.

That some of their compeers did fall at a period anterior to the fall of man, we do know of a truth; but this was previous to the revelation of the power of the cross, and of the purpose of God to reconcile all things unto himself by the blood thereof. *Elect* angels (so called in contra-distinction to those

ment a biblical scholar. A clause or two of the original he takes the liberty of putting in *italics*.

"But the information in this line, and by means of these materials (cherubic symbols), reaches its farthest limits, when in the Apocalyptic vision of a triumphant church, the four and twenty elders, who represent her, are seen sitting in royal state and crowned with majesty close beside the throne, with the cherubic forms in and around it. There, at last, the ideal and actual freely meet together—the *merely symbolical representatives of the life of God, and its real possessors, the members of a redeemed and glorified church.* And the inspiring element of the whole, that which at once explains all and connects all harmoniously together, is the central object appearing there of a 'Lamb, as if it had been slain, in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders.' Here the mystery resolves itself; in this consummate wonder all other wonders cease, all difficulties vanish. The Lamb of God, uniting together heaven and earth, human guilt and divine energy, man's nature and God's perfections, has opened a pathway for the fallen *to the very high and pinnacle of created being.*"

who kept not their first estate), once brought under the attractive power of the cross, are kept steadfast thereby in their allegiance. The peace brought about by the blood of the cross, the reconciliation effected by it, must needs be a permanent one. No other would be worthy of God, or of the means whereby it was achieved. Take away from it this element of permanency; admit that revolt may again throw into confusion the restored harmony of the universe; let sin, discordant and rebellious, again win over heavenly hierarchs, and the glory of the great reconciliation is gone forever. Ichabod is written all over the temple it was the eternal purpose of God to rear to the praise of his own great name. But no such catastrophe is to be apprehended. The majestic cross of Christ stands as an all-sufficient and eternal barrier against it. And by the cross, we mean the efficacious expiation Christ offered for sin as contemplated by admiring and adoring angels in its consummate result, a glorified and triumphant church. "He shall come," we repeat, "to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." There all the perfections of God are exhibited in a form so stupendously grand and imposing, and shine with a lustre so infinitely bright, that the moral effect upon the holy universe is irresistible, and as lasting as the immortal life of the redeemed. The sweet, yet awful wonders of the cross, will never cease to attract the regard of angels. They will desire forever to look into these things. God is love; love is the fulfilling of the law; the love of a dying Saviour shed abroad in the sinner's heart, enkindles undying love to him; and the love of God, as it beams from the cross in undiminished, and relatively, in ever-increasing effulgence, binds the universe together in an eternal harmony. This light of divine love illumines, and transports, and henceforth holds in everlasting fealty all holy beings fast to the throne of heaven. To it we may transfer, with exceeding propriety, Milton's inimitably sublime apostrophe:

"Hail, holy Light, offspring of Heav'n first-born,
Or th' of Eternal co-eternal beam!
May I express thee unblam'd? since God is light,
And never but in unapproached light
Dwelt from eternity, dwelt then in thee,
Bright effluence of bright essence increate."

In the light of the cross finite natures make their nearest approach to the "bright essence increate" of the Infinite. All other manifestations of the Divine Nature are utterly incomparable to this. It is God manifest in flesh, "seen of angels;" and once seen, seen forever, and forever felt in its mighty drawing. The light of the cross will never be withdrawn. Angels will never cease to feel its power. It is the power of God, not only to man, but to the universe as well. Light, and love, and harmony, uninterrupted and unending, divinely bright and pure, are the abiding effluences of the cross. Here at last we find, or rather God discloses to us, an effectual means of securing angels in holiness and blessedness. All the fullness of God dwells in Christ; and saints in glory partake of that fullness, without admixture of corruption. The exhibition of it exerts an irresistibly constraining influence. The power of temptation is broken by it; nay, the very approach of temptation is forbidden by the effulgence of its resplendent glories.

All created intelligences, *ex necessitate rei*, are under law. Upon their creation, the government of God instantly obtains; and stern, inexorable justice, is the rule of its administration. In this condition of things, and in the nature of the case, all that appears necessary to accomplish the fall of any created being, is a sufficient temptation; for he is fallible because finite, and finite because created. Now, temptation, for aught that appears to the contrary, may rise to any degree short of infinite. No finite being, therefore, is able to resist all possible temptation. All are liable to fall, so long as a holy, but finite nature and natural law, are the only elements which enter into the problem of their stability. If one temptation does not conquer, another and a stronger one may. The Infinite alone is secure. It is impossible for God to sin, because he is God, and can not be tempted of evil; and temptation can not become infinite in degree, because God tempteth no one. Some angels fell; man fell; all the angels might have fallen sometime in the endless cycles of duration, had not God interposed. All did not fall with the devil and his confederate legions, either because they did not come within the circle of their temptation, or because they successfully resisted it; but a stronger temptation might have overcome

even them. Those who fell not are the *elect* angels. For them and for fallen men, God did interpose. According to the good pleasure of his will, some men were elected unto everlasting life, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. The angels who kept their first estate, were elected unto a confirmed state of holiness, through the influence of the awfully near approach of the Creator to the creature in the redemption of elect men. "*At that day, ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.*" Yes, and all the angels of God shall know that mysterious, awful truth—shall *see* it, and feel its mighty power forever. The stupendous mysteries of the in-being of God in man, will exercise their vast powers as eternity rolls on; and their high hallelujahs burst forth ever new as these mysteries unfold themselves to their adoring contemplation. The matchless, the consuming holiness of God revealed therein, will bar not only the entrance of sin itself, but every temptation to sin. How awful goodness is!

Thus the harmony of the universe is restored and secured by the cross. Men and angels are at one again, and join their voices in unceasing praises to the everlasting Head of the new heavens and the new earth. The Son is glorified, and the Father is glorified in the Son. All is to the glory of God. The grand purpose of redemption is completely realized.

Following the hints given in the Scriptures of truth, of the great purpose God is pursuing in the redemption of mankind, to wit, to bring the whole universe of intelligent beings (with the exception of the fallen angels and that portion of our race who shall be eternally lost), into one harmonious and perfect empire under the scepter of Jesus Christ, we have endeavored to show how that purpose is effected by means of the cross. It is by imparting to the elect of earth a new and divine life derived from the second Adam, whereby, in the language of Dr. Fairbairn, they are exalted *to the very height and pinnacle of created being*. The elect of heaven, in consonance with the design of God in their creation, recognize this proud preëminence; and amid the supreme and everlasting manifestations of the divine holiness revealed therein—blazing upon them with a splendor inconceivably majestic and efficacious—they are secured not only against the power, but the

very approach of temptation. It is necessary now to show that *the gathering together in one of all things in Christ—the great reconciliation*—does refer to such an empire, and can not by a fair interpretation of the Scriptures be narrowed down to the union of Jews and Gentiles in one body in Christ; or, which is equally short of the truth, be restricted to the people of God, some of whom are now in heaven and others still on the earth, and who are all at last to be brought together to the heavenly inheritance. That redemption, in its strictly technical sense, is confined to sinners of the human race, is readily admitted, but this by no means excludes the notion of its having relations to other creatures of God. What these relations are, and how angels participate in the benefits of redemption, have been pointed out. The illustrious Calvin well remarks: “What hinders us from saying that the angels also have been *gathered together*? Not that they were ever scattered, but their attachment to the service of God is now perfect and their state is eternal. What comparison is there between a creature and the Creator without the interposition of a Mediator? So far as they are creatures, had it not been for the benefit which they derived from Christ, they would have been liable to change and to sin, and consequently their happiness would not have been eternal. Who, then, will deny that both angels and men have been brought back to a fixed order by the grace of Christ? Men had been lost, and angels were not beyond the reach of danger. By *gathering* both in his own body Christ hath united them to God the Father, and established actual harmony between heaven and earth.” And again: “It was, however, necessary that angels also should be made to be at peace with God; for, being creatures, they were not beyond the risk of falling, had they not been confirmed by the grace of Christ. This, however, is of no small importance for the perpetuity of peace with God, to have a fixed standing in righteousness, so as to have no longer any fear of fall or revolt.” He even carries his views so far as to add: “Farther, in that very obedience which they render to God, there is not such absolute perfection as to give satisfaction to God in every respect and without the need of pardon.”

We now give, in the authorized English version, the chief proof-texts relied on to sustain our idea of the extent of the

Saviour's work, though our criticisms will necessarily be on the Greek text:

Eph. i: 9 and 10: "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; *even* in him." Eph. i: 20-23: "Which (the working of his mighty power) he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all."

Col. i: 16-20: "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist, and he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all *things* he might have the preëminence. For it pleased *the Father* that in him should all fullness dwell: and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, *I say*, whether *they be* things in earth, or things in heaven."

See also Phil. ii: 6-11.

These scriptures teach with perfect clearness (1), that Jesus Christ is our Mediator, and as such, is elevated to the throne of universal dominion. He is the supreme ruler of the universe. *All* power in heaven and in earth is *given* unto him. He is the head of *all* principality and power, angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto him. Indeed, this proposition is announced so frequently, and in terms so perspicuous, that it is quite unnecessary to multiply proofs. It may be remarked, however, that the obedience of the heavenly intelligences to Messiah as their king, is not a constrained obedience, but a willing, filial, spontaneous recognition of his claims, and a glad acquiescence of, his rule. (2.) This exaltation

of Messiah the Prince is in consequence of his incarnation and death—the reward of his humiliation and sufferings. “Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory.” The officiating priest becomes a sceptered king. He passes from the altar to the throne. His kingdom is his glory and his reward. But the special object now in hand is to show (3), that these scriptures teach the sovereignty of Jesus Christ over the universe, which is not established by a mere arbitrary act of almighty power, but is brought about through the influence of the cross; that the redemptive work of the Saviour *has* relations to other beings than men. And whether we have succeeded or not in pointing out the precise method whereby the cross harmonizes the universe, it is important to settle it as a fact revealed in the word of God, that the direct sweep of its influence is not confined to mortal or immortal men. It is something more than material creations and natural laws, which excite to praise and adoration as intelligent beings behold in them the wisdom, power, and goodness of God. It is a direct and positive power, a controlling influence in the realm of mind. It is the touchstone of fealty to the great Jehovah, and the sure pledge of eternal life to all the elect of God, whether angels or men. The Lamb in the midst of the throne is the admiration and the hope of the universe. The efficacy of his sacrifice is infinite in degree and limitless in extent.

No one can fail to be struck with the universality of the terms used in these texts or the uniformity of that usage. The obvious sense, therefore, of the expressions ought to be accepted, unless the context, or the proportion of faith, or the nature of the subject itself, necessarily imposes limitations. The generalizing neuter τὰ πάντα is not decisive of itself, it is true, as it may always be limited by the subject-matter of discourse; yet even in such a passage as Gal. iii: 22, the propriety of restricting it absolutely to human kind, may be questioned. Human kind certainly is the chief constituent of the τὰ πάντα there, but may it not be intended to embrace also the whole mundane sphere of things of which man is the lord? What Paul says of the πείσεις in the eighth of Romans, gives no little plausibility to such an opinion. There is a profound depth of meaning in the divine word which we are in

constant danger of overlooking. When, however, τὰ πάντα is supplemented by the addition of τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, the absolute totality of created existence must be intended—all beings and things whatsoever and wheresoever—with the exception of fallen angels and the finally impenitent of mankind. This limitation the proportion of faith imperatively requires, the Scriptures constantly teaching that they are to be shut up in hell forever. After a careful examination we find that τὰ πάντα followed by the clause cited above, occurs three times in the New Testament—all in the passages quoted from Ephesians and Colossians.* Once that clause follows πᾶσα πατριὰ (Eph. iii: 15), once πᾶν χρίσμα (Rev. v: 13), and once πᾶσα ἐξουσία (Matthew xxviii: 18). These are all the instances in which it follows πας either alone or joined to a substantive. Heaven and earth in the Greek are found sometimes with, sometimes without the article, belonging to that class of nouns with which it is allowable to omit it. Now, what can be the object in appending this clause to τὰ πάντα? Most manifestly to show that it is not, as in Gal. iii: 22, to be limited by the context. It is to guard against the very error into which they fall who urge, whatever be the reason, that it is limited. And what seems to prove this conclusively is the fact that *heaven and earth, or the heavens and the earth*, is the common formula with the sacred writers to express the totality of created things. There is no more warrant from the *usus loquendi* to apply τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς κ. τ. ε. τ. γῆς to the two classes of redeemed men, some of whom are in heaven and others still on earth, than to Jews and Gentiles.

In Col. i: 16, there can be no room for doubt, for the following clauses prove the universality of the reference by specifying the two great divisions of the creation—the visible or material, and the invisible or spiritual; and the latter division is itself specified by an enumeration of four particulars. “*Itac distributione universam creaturam complectitur*,” says Bishop Davenant. The truth of the remark is as palpable as the sun in the heavens. Now, let any one take up his Greek Testa-

* In Col. i: 20, the parts composing the whole are expressed under the form of correlative disjunction, by εἴτε—εἴτε. The effect of this, without altering the sense, is to direct the attention more distinctly to the specific parts of the πᾶς. See I. Cor. xii: 13.

ment, and read on from this verse through the twentieth; and the conclusion, as it appears to us, will be inevitable to every one whose judgment is not warped by a theory which will not admit it, that the *τὰ πάντα* of the twentieth is co-extensive with that of the sixteenth—except as modified in the manner, and for the reason already mentioned. It should be observed, however, that devils and lost men are not permitted to disturb the harmony of things after the reconciliation. They are confined to their own place. In the twentieth verse, the means of the reconciliation of all things unto the Father is interposed between *τὰ πάντα* and its specifying clause; and in that clause the order of the words heaven and earth is transposed. This change of order, whereby earth stands first, occurring as it does directly after the writer has named the blood of the cross as the means of reconciliation, may be intended to indicate, as Ellicott suggests, the closer connection of the death of Christ with *the things upon the earth*. All things were created by Jesus Christ, and all things are to be restored by him; yet to some the cross holds a nearer relation than to others; but all feel its peace-making efficacy. Good angels, it is true, can not be said to be reconciled to God in the sense that penitent sinners are: they were never at enmity with him. Penitent sinners are reconciled from a state of enmity; good angels from the *possibility* of a state of enmity. If not enemies in *esse*, they are in *posse*. The reconciliation in their case marks, not a change of character, but a change of relation. But the whole difficulty arising from the use of the term reconciliation vanishes, if we admit that what is here spoken of is not the reconciliation of the *τὰ πάντα*, considered as one party, to God, considered as the other; but the restoration of harmony between the different parts of the universe itself. Sin has set them at variance one with another. Deadly strife now rages. Peace is made through the blood of the cross. The determination of this point depends upon the construction we put upon *εἰς αὐτόν* (or, as others read, *αὐτόν*) in the twentieth verse. Does it refer to God as one of the parties between whom reconciliation is effected? We venture to assert, with some degree of confidence, that it does not. With the aid of Bruder's Concordance we have examined every passage where the verb *ἀποκαταλλάττειν* and the simpler *καταλλάττειν* and

διαλλάττειν occur, and in every instance (unless the one now under consideration be an exception), the party to whom one is said to be reconciled, is put in the dative after them, without a preposition. In two instances neither substantive nor pronoun marks the remote object. In one, Rom. v: 10, the dative is necessarily supplied by the mind from the preceding clause: the other is Col. i: 21. So far as the limited means at hand enable us to determine, the compound form ἀπό does not occur in the Greek classics; but κατὰλλάττειν and διαλλάττειν, to reconcile, as in the New Testament, are followed by the dative of the remote object, or by the accusative with πρός, not εἰς. We request the reader to examine for himself the passages in the New Testament. Ellicott, while maintaining the wide sense of the phrase "to restore (reconcile) all things," translates εἰς αὐτόν, *unto himself*, and considers it a case of the *constructio praeagnans*. But how so? If the regular construction is to put the remote object in the dative after these verbs, as we have seen, how can the insertion of εἰς, followed by the accusative, give the additional idea of "*union with?*" Moreover, the union is with Christ—not with God: it is *in him* that all things are gathered together in one and reconciled. As for the word "access" which he brings in from Eph. ii: 18, it is enough to say there is no "access" *here*, except what would be implied with either construction in the idea of reconciliation—and no *constructio praeagnans there*. The critical scholar can read his note and the reference to Winer, and then decide for himself. What, then, is the sense of εἰς αὐτόν? The same as in the sixteenth verse—for *himself*. It designates the last end of the reconciliation. All things are reconciled in and under "the Son of his love," to the glory of the Father.* The reconciliation is *unto* the Father as the end of it.

An argument for the universality of the reconciliation referred to in Col. i: 20, may be drawn also from the verse

* We write *Father*, not *God*, designedly, in order to indicate that the grammatical subject of εὐδόκησεν, in the nineteenth verse, is *Father*, continued from the twelfth verse—not Χριστός, nor θεός, nor πλῆρωμα. The intermediate verses describe the character and works of the Son. Such appears to have been the opinion of our translators also, though they have apparently (perhaps, however, only apparently) treated the verb as impersonal. Compare the translation here with that of I. Cor. i: 21. This verb is always personal in the New Testament.

following. Undoubtedly that appears to be the application of a general truth to the special case of the Colossians.

We call attention next to the passage where the phrase, *in heaven and upon earth*, follows *πᾶσα πατριὰ*.—Eph. iii: 15. *Ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται*. Does this mean, “Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named (Eng. Ver.)? or, from (*i. e.*, after) whom every family (race) in heaven and on earth is [*thus*] named? — *i. e.* named *α πατριὰ*—a race. For this simple interpretation of *ὀνομάζεται*, which avoids all interpolations after it, and all arbitrary renderings of it, we are indebted to Ellicott, who himself accredits it to Meyer. Every race has the name *πατριὰ* given to it, because every race alike is the offspring of the universal *Πατήρ*. If this interpretation, as natural and intelligible as it is simple, be adopted, it settles everything else. And confirmatory of it, is the fact that wherever the word *πατριὰ* is used in the New Testament, it is associated with *πατήρ* itself, or with the name of some *πατήρ*. Here, it is *τον πατέρα*, the Father—the great Father of all. But without insisting further on this point at present, let us pass on. Every Greek scholar knows that to justify the rendering of *πᾶσα πατριὰ* given in the English version, the article ought, according to the ordinary rule, to be inserted. Several reasons are assigned for neglecting the rule in this instance, which will be noticed in what follows. But this is not the only difficulty of a like nature, though commonly the only one adverted to. For, if the phrase following *πατριὰ* is descriptive of the whole family as divided at present into two classes, one in heaven and the other upon earth, the article should stand before both *ἐν* and *ἐπὶ*. And not only so, but if the apostle intended to point out these two coördinate divisions conceived of as constituting one whole, we should look for the particle *τε*, or an additional *καί*. See Jelf, §758, and Winer, Sect. LIII., 4. With these emendations, and overlooking the omission of the article with *πᾶσα*, the verse would read, “Of whom the whole family, both that (division of it) in heaven and that (division of it) on earth, is named.” All would then be perspicuous; and had the apostle intended to express the idea conveyed in our version, he would certainly have been more explicit. After devoting more than thirty years to the study of New Testa-

ment diction, Winer renders the following judgment as the result of his protracted and matured labors: "Explicitness is characteristic of later Greek in general, and of the New Testament in particular." But the truth is, the omission of the article before *παρὰ* is decisive. The Rev. T. S. Green (Gram. of the N. T. Dialect, p. 195), lays down the rule as follows: "When a singular noun, except such as are strictly abstracts, and proper names, has the article, *πᾶς* must be rendered 'the whole;' when the singular noun is anarthrous, it signifies 'every.'" For an illustration of both usages, in a single verse, see Rom. iii: 19. Where the difference caused by the omission or the insertion of the article is so great, it may well be supposed that a corresponding carefulness is observed. Such is indisputably the fact. A more unvarying rule of construction than the one cited above can not be found.* Winer, referring to the passage now under discus-

* A careful inspection of every passage where *πᾶς* occurs in Paul's epistles (including Hebrews), and indeed of nearly all the New Testament, with direct reference to the verification of this rule, convinces the present writer that it is well founded—that there are absolutely no exceptions to it. The only case of real difficulty is found in Eph. ii: 21; but here some of the critical editors retain the article. Griesbach does not remove it from the text, and it is found in at least two of the most ancient and valuable codices. Bloomfield inserts it, affirming that the external testimony is *not against* it, and the internal all *in favor* of it. Scholz retains it. Being at best, therefore, a doubtful case, Eph. ii: 21 may fairly be set aside in determining the authority of Green's rule. The four cases to the contrary, cited by Eadie, are wide of the mark. *Πάντα πειρασμὸν* (Luke iv: 13), means *every temptation*—every form or species of temptation, and exactly corresponds to the facts recorded in the sacred narrative. *Πᾶση σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων* (Acts vii: 22), omitting the consideration that it is an abstract noun, means *in every branch of Egyptian wisdom*—*πᾶς* denoting *extension* rather than *intensity*. The other two (Matt. ii: 3, and Acts ii: 36) come under the head of proper names. For the last, see Winer and Green. But it is idle to attempt to show that *παρὰ* may be classed with proper names. *Πᾶσα γραφή* (2 Tim. iii: 16), which Eadie might have cited with more propriety, means *every scripture*.

In the notes appended to the translation of Ephesians, issued by the American Bible Union, are references to justify rendering *πάσα οἰκοδομὴ* (without the article), in Eph. ii: 21, *the whole building*; but in all of them *πᾶς* is in the plural.

In connection with *πᾶς*, abstract nouns are found both with and without the article, but with different shades of meaning. *τὴν πᾶσαν μακροθυμίαν* (1 Tim. i: 16) is the totality of long-suffering, *every conceivable manifestation of it aggregated and concentrated* in the Saviour's dealing with Paul: *ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ* (2 Tim. iv: 2), is *in (with) every exhibition or manner of long-suffering*. The last is analo-

sion, says, "*πᾶσα πατριὰ* obviously means *every race*." It is so clear to the mind of this eminent scholar, as not to admit of a doubt. Middleton's testimony is of the same purport. Indeed, if any question at all of construction may be allowed to be settled by the laws of language, this is one. The second rendering, therefore, of the whole verse, as given above, is, beyond all reasonable doubt, correct. Aside from the extreme probability that the words (v. 15) of *our Lord Jesus Christ* are an interpolation, the evident paronomasia between *πατέρα* and *πατριὰ* shows plainly enough that the former is the antecedent of the relative *ὃς*. It is to the universal Father, from whom every *πατριὰ* is so named, that Paul bows his knees. True, he approaches him through the mediation of Jesus Christ, in whom he is the Father of all penitent and believing sinners; and through whom the paternal relation between him and them is reestablished, so that man again becomes really one of the many *πατριαὶ* of his rational creatures. So far, then, is this view of the verse from destroying its harmony with the context, that it adds immensely to the dignity and scope of the whole. Grammar and exegesis are not at issue. On the contrary, grammar does not allow, neither does the context require, the rendering of the authorized version. The conclusion, therefore, to which we come—the special point we have had in view all along—is that the phrase *in heaven and on earth* is used here, as elsewhere, to denote universality. Every family in the universe is so named from the common Father of all.

There can be no dispute about the meaning of this phrase in Rev. v: 13, where it follows *πάν κτίσμα*. It can mean nothing but the universe; and all the more manifestly so, if possible, by reason of the strengthening additions. As little dispute can there be about its meaning in Matt. xxviii: 18, where it follows *πᾶσα ἐξουσία*: "All power is given unto me in

gous to a frequent use of the plural of abstract nouns in Latin, and of *omnis* with the singular, giving a concrete application to the abstract noun. *Εν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ* (Eph. i: 8), with deference to the high authority of Winer, is *in every kind of wisdom*—not "*full*" wisdom, but *manifold*—according to the sense of *πᾶς* noted above. The same may be said of *πᾶσα ἐξουσία* (Matt. xxviii: 18); it is *every kind of authority*, executive, legislative and judicial. See also Acts v: 23, and I. Tim. i: 15, and apply the same principle.

heaven and on earth." These, with Eph. i: 10, are all the instances in which it is preceded by $\pi\alpha\varsigma$; and all in which it occurs at all, except in the Lord's Prayer (Matt. vi: 10, and Luke xi: 2), where $\kappa\alpha\iota$ is not the simple grammatical copula, but is employed "as strictly a comparative particle" (Winer, liii: 5), or in the sense of *also*, the comparative particle correlative to $\omega\varsigma$ being supplied.

Turning now to Eph. i: 10, and carrying along the result of our investigations into the import of $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ following the universal term $\pi\alpha\varsigma$, it does seem arbitrary in the extreme to affirm that here one term of that phrase points out the present locality of one portion of the redeemed, and the other the locality of another portion. How perfectly easy was it to avoid all ambiguity! If the apostle had it in mind to predicate the *gathering together* in one of believers only—of no body else and nothing else—how natural for him to write *all those that believe*, instead of *all things in heaven and on earth!* Explicitness demanded it. The very terms used are adapted to mislead; and instead of being corrected by comparing scripture with scripture, the error is confirmed thereby. It will be conceded, nay, it is conceded, that $\delta\nu\alpha\kappa\epsilon\varphi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ signifies to gather together *again* in one—the distinct force of $\delta\nu\acute{\alpha}$ being retained; and, preserving the power of the middle voice, to gather together again in one *for himself*—the middle voice here having the effect, though with a subdued force, of $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ in Col. i: 20. In its complete meaning, this verb points back to a previous state of unity; contemplates an existing state of severance and dispersion; and points forward to a future reconstruction. The existing dissevered condition of things, it must be admitted, too, is one that relates chiefly to the moral state of rational creatures, unless we choose to ignore the evident spirit of the divine Word. They are not at one now because sin separates them. Remove it, and all would move on together harmoniously; would be truly united, though living in worlds divided by countless leagues of space. These *moral* ideas are associated at once in the mind of every attentive reader of the Scriptures, with a dividing or a gathering and reconciling of moral beings. And so of the future reconstruction; surely it does not find its grand consummation in bringing either a part or the whole of the righteous

universe into one dwelling-place. The intervention whereby the primal unity is restored is by moral means, and to moral ends. And yet we are told that the whole truth the apostle was commissioned to reveal, when by the Spirit he indited this verse, is, that at some future period, called the fullness of times, God will gather together the entire company of redeemed men, some of whom are now in heaven and others still on earth, into one undivided family—*i. e.*, into the same local abode! Can it be that this is all the truth contained in this great utterance, which commences so majestically in the ninth verse, and ends with what has been proved to be, in every other instance, an emphatic addition to the ordinary term for universality? It were far more probable (if a restriction must be imposed on his language), looking at the manner in which the same apostle elsewhere speaks of the union of Jews and Gentiles in church fellowship, that he speaks of that event here also.

But let us look distinctly at this theory in the light of what is necessarily implied in the definition of ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι. (1). It implies a previous state of unity. But there was no original unity among the redeemed of the Lord, either moral or local. As unconverted sinners, they were alienated one from another, as well as from God; and were separated both in time and place. As regenerated men, they were never gathered together in one except as they are all one in Christ; and they are that to-day as really as they ever will be. There never was a local union of them. This theory, therefore, fails to meet the demand of the definition in the first point. (2). The definition implies an existing condition of severance and dispersion. But all the redeemed are one body in and under Christ this present hour; always have been, and always will be. The same is true of them at any period in the history of redemption, from the beginning to the consummation of ages. And just so far as the great work of the Mediator terminates on the condition of ransomed sinners, the mystery and greatness and glory of the divine purpose converge at this very point; they are each and all united to their living Head, and thus have union and communion one with another, and together constitute one body, even the mystical body of Christ. It is an intense lowering of the dignity and grandeur

of the union of all believers, to put forward so prominently the idea of contiguity. Whatever of reality there may be in such a union, it is after all but the outward expression of that which is inward and spiritual, and which gives value and significance to the outward. Furthermore, the whole context proves that the apostle is dealing with the spiritual realities of redemption. Relations in space are lost sight of in the surpassing glory of spiritual and eternal relations, established, as we believe, between the various races of rational beings. Again: in passages analogous to Eph. i: 9, 10, where the same apostle treats of the privileges bestowed on the Gentiles by the Gospel, it is evident he refers to their incorporation with the true Israel—Israel after the Spirit. See Eph. iii: 3–6. The union, therefore, is not of the kind they contend for who restrict the apostle's language to mankind; and if so, there is not an existing separation such as a *regathering* implies. Believers, both those in heaven and those on earth, are one body *now*. (3). If the views just presented be correct, neither can there be any proper reconstruction after men are once united to Christ in their effectual calling. *That* would be the gathering together again in one, whether the previous unity be conceived of as existing among men themselves in the loins of Adam before the fall, or between them and God. It is demonstrable, therefore, as it seems to us, that this theory of a union of all believers in one local habitation, meets neither the fair demands of what is implied in the verb ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, nor of the context.

It is worthy also of very particular notice, that the apostle does not say, "To gather together again in one all things *that are* in Christ?" Hence, the argument derived from the fact that believers alone are ever said to be *in Christ*, falls to the ground. Were ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ an attributive of τὰ πάντα, perspicuity would require the insertion of τα, or τὰ ὄντα, before ἐν in a case like this, even if it could be fairly claimed as an exception to the general rule. See Winer, sec. xx. It ought to be observed, too, that Χριστῷ has the article. The common formula, upon which the argument hinges, is simply ἐν Χριστῷ. The truth is, ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ is to be joined to the verb—not to τὰ πάντα; and what the apostle asserts, is that it is the purpose of God that all things, in the fullness of times, shall be

gathered together again in one in the Christ. All things are to be reunited *in Him* precisely in the sense in which they were originally created in Him (ἐν αὐτῷ). Col. i:16. "He is the creative center of all things, the causal element of their existence; the *causa conditionalis*—the act of creation being supposed to rest in Him, and to depend on Him for its completion and realization." (See Ellicott in loc., and Winer, sec. xlviii, pp. 406-8, d, and note 3, on p. 407.) So Christ is the causal element of the regathering of all things—the act of regathering being supposed to center in Him as the causal element of its realization. We close these criticisms with simply calling attention to the two following remarks: 1. As the regathering in Ephesians is manifestly a reuniting of the different parts of the universe to *each other*, without, of course, excluding the idea that all as one whole are reunited to God; so the reconciliation in the parallel passage in Colossians, it may be argued analogically, is a reconciliation of the various races and orders of the universe, and not one between them collectively as one party, and God as the other. 2. If the verb *to reconcile* must be construed in its strict theological sense, and if the reconciliation is unto God as an offended party, and if by *the things in heaven* be meant the souls of the redeemed, then, how can they be said to be reconciled unto God? The very reason why they are in heaven now is because they were reconciled to Him before they left the earth.

In the final scheme of things, therefore, as ordained of God, and revealed in the Scriptures, and as the consummate result of the mediatorial intervention of the incarnate Son, in its august and universal sweep—we find as the grand center of the whole, the throne of God and the Lamb. Next, circling round and hard by the throne, and most mysteriously allied to it as partakers of a divine nature and instinct with the life of Christ, are the redeemed of the Lord. Next, according to their rank, come the angels, ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands. All constitute one perfect and harmonious empire. The devil and his angels, with the finally impenitent of mankind, are confined in the prison-house of perdition. They shall no more go forth to disturb the harmony of Messiah's kingdom. Universal concord reigns forever. Sin shall no more blast the happiness or the happy

fellowship of the blessed. We call this order of things *final*, and have assumed elsewhere that the kingdom of Messiah, thus constituted in its completed estate, is an everlasting kingdom. Now it is inchoate—in a formative condition. It will be finished when the last one of the elect is gathered in and glorified. It is not in place here to discuss the question of its permanency.

In the preceding part of this essay, we have endeavored to comprehend the following particulars: (a,) to state what the commonly accepted opinion of the New Life is, and, by way of contrast, to state as distinctly as the nature of the case admits, what it really is; (b,) to remove the objection derived from the mysterious nature of it; (c,) to show that the change involved in it is but analogous to the transformation which we do know the human body undergoes at the resurrection; (d,) to show that the idea of it herein set forth, is presented in the symbols of the Old and New Testaments; and lastly, (e,) to show that it is the purpose of God through the influence of the cross, manifested with supreme glory and efficacy in the divine life of glorified men, to confirm the elect angels, and out of the elect of heaven and earth—reconciled and gathered together again in one—to constitute one harmonious and everlasting empire whose head is the Lamb. In the subsequent part, we shall aim to exhibit the more direct proofs of such a new life, and to show its relations to other doctrines “which are most surely believed among us.”

ERRATA.

The reader will please correct the following Errata in our article on Imputation, in the December number:

- On page 547, l. 14, for *Francke* read *Franecker*.
- P. 561, l. 11 for *cause of* read *cause or*.
- P. 563, l. 5, for *by his* read *of his*.
- P. 566, l. 6, for *corruption* read *conception*.
- P. 567, l. 2 from bottom, for *these* read *thus*.
- P. 568, l. 1, for *will* read *with*.
- P. 570, l. 8 of note, for *Sac* read *Sec*.
- P. 571, l. 23, for *where* read *when*.
- P. 572, l. 11 from bottom, for *through* read *though*.
- P. 573, l. 20, after *And* read *we*.
- P. 576, l. 10, for *facts* read *parts*.
- P. 577, l. 9, for *views* read *view*.

DANVILLE REVIEW.

No. II.

JUNE, 1863.

ART. I.—STUDIES ON THE BIBLE, No. IV. *The Exodus; Passover; Priesthood; Borrowing the Jewels.**

ONE of the leading epochs in sacred history was formed by the departure of the Hebrews from the land of Egypt. The chosen seed was originally in a succession of individuals: Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. In the children of Jacob the visible church expanded into a family. The sojourn in Egypt consolidated the separate clans into the unity of a common life; and the exodus transformed twelve tribes of bondsmen, apparently helpless, into a nation of kings and priests, powerful in numbers and resources, compacted together by a community of race and traditions, and inspired by the sense of an exalted destiny.

In order to obtain a clear insight into the narrative of the exodus, it is necessary to appreciate what was peculiar in the destruction of the first-born of Egypt, and in the incidents

* HELPS TO THE STUDY.—*On the Passover:* Hengstenberg's Auth. Pent. 2: 294. Witsius' Covenants, B. IV, chap. ix. M'Donald's Pent. 1: 209, 2: 268-272. Kurtz' Old Cov't. 2: 294-311. Fairbairn's Typol. 2: 404. Kitto's Cyclo. Art. "Pass-over." Orme's Lord's Supper, 10-27. McGee's Atone. Disserta. 35. Bib. Sac. 1845. p. 405. Calvin's Harm. Pent. 1: 220, 456, 458.

The Priesthood, etc.: Kurtz, 3: 203-6. Fairbairn, 2: 244-275. Hengstenberg, 2: 329-340.

Borrowing the Jewels: Hengstenberg, 2: 417. Kurtz, 2: 319. McDonald, 2: 57. Calvin on Ex. iii: 22 and xi: 2. Rosenmüller on Ex. iii: 22. Kitto Art. "Weights and Measures." Arbuthnot's Tables. Hebrew Concordance sub voce *Shahal*.

connected therewith. Before the series of plagues began, Jehovah gave this commission to Moses: "Thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the LORD, Israel is my son, even my first-born; and I say unto thee, Let my son go that he may serve me; and if thou refuse to let him go, behold I will slay thy son, even thy first-born." Ex. iv: 22, 23. From these words it appears, first, that the destruction of the first-born was, from the beginning, contemplated as the crowning act in the series of calamities about to be inflicted on Egypt. The preceding plagues were, therefore, merely preliminary to that. The nine were in the nature of warnings, the tenth was a work of final judgment. That destruction, secondly, was relevant to the sin of Egypt; according to a well-known principle in the divine government whereby the leading characteristic of the sin is reiterated in the leading characteristic of the punishment; as in the law of retaliation, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. The oppression of Israel, God's first-born son, was the crime—the destruction of the first-born sons of the oppressors, was the penalty. The visitation, thirdly, was purely supernatural. Unlike most of the other wonders, it did not rest on any natural basis; that is to say, it was not a curse native-born to the country, under a form intensely aggravated by the power of God, but it was altogether a strange terror; a species of retribution never before employed, never since repeated. To this it should be added, fourthly, that the plague was not introduced by human intervention. During the progress of the ten wonders, the ministries engaged rose in dignity. The first three were brought forward by the instrumentality of Aaron in the use of his rod; at the fourth, and thence onward, the most prominent part was assigned to Moses; but in the tenth Moses warned the Hebrews that it was impending, and then stepped aside at the approach of the Jehovah-Angel. It was, therefore, an immediate manifestation of supernatural power. God had said to the king, "*I will slay thy son, even thy first-born.*"

Among the incidents connected with this visitation of God, the institution of the Passover was, perhaps, the most important. By divine command, each family of the Hebrews selected, on the tenth day of the current month, a lamb or a kid without blemish, a male of the first year. On the fourteenth

day of the month, at evening, it was killed; its blood was sprinkled upon the door-posts and lintels of the house; the body of the lamb was roasted entire, and eaten by the whole family with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. They partook of the repast in haste, with their loins girded, sandals on their feet, and staff in hand, ready, at a given signal, to set off for Canaan. About midnight the Almighty went through the land smiting the first-born of Egypt, but passing over the houses the door-posts of which were marked with the blood of the paschal lamb. Hence the ceremony was called the feast of the Passover, and it was appointed to be observed annually, as a perpetual ordinance. Various amendments were afterward introduced into the law of the Passover, adapted to a settled church-state; but these need not be dwelt upon in this place. The fundamental ordinance may be found in Ex. xii: 1-20; the persons allowed to be present are described in xii: 43-49; the original ordinance is abridged in xxiii: 15, in xxxiv: 18, and in Lev. xxiii: 4; further directions as to the communicants are contained in Num. ix: 1-4; and the sacrifices associated with the feast are mentioned in Num. xxviii: 16-25; and the final form of the ritual, adapted to the Mosaic institutes of worship and to the condition of the church in Canaan is of record in Deut. xvi: 1-12.

Nothing is more strictly defined in these Scriptures, than the relation between the shedding of blood and the redemption of Israel from the destruction of the first-born. The Hebrews as well as the Egyptians had been guilty of idolatry; therefore the first three plagues were laid upon both people alike. Afterward the Hebrews were spared while the Egyptians were punished. But in the final execution of judgment, a new principle was associated with the grace by which the chosen seed were saved from death; the principle of redemption by the shedding and sprinkling of blood. The victim divinely selected was a lamb or a kid without blemish; the officiating priest, in the absence of a sacerdotal order, was the head of the family; the altar, in the absence of a public place of sacrifice, was the doorway of the house; the sprinkling of the blood upon the lintels and door-posts was an act of obedience to God, and of faith in his promise; the passing over of the houses which were marked by the blood, was an act of

God having respect unto his own way of salvation ; and the whole was a true expiation for sin, offered by the sinner, and accepted by the Sovereign Judge. "And the blood," said Jehovah, "shall be to you a token upon the houses where ye are : and *when I see the blood*, I will pass over you." Ex. xii : 13. Comp. xii : 23. Some of the cardinal principles which enter into the salvation of the Gospel are fully expressed in this transaction. God will have a chosen people to serve him ; the subjects of this saving grace must be chosen not only, but redeemed as well ; this redemption is effected by the blood of the Lamb ; the shed blood must be appropriated to himself, by an act of faith on the part of the sinner ; and when the Almighty, coming to judge the wicked, "*sees the blood*," he will pass over his chosen, redeemed and believing people.

It is a fact, every way remarkable, that some of the soundest of the early Protestant theologians would not admit that the Passover was, strictly speaking, a sacrificial institute. It was a sacrament, they alleged, not a sacrifice. They were driven to this position by what appeared to them to be a polemical necessity. The Roman Catholic divines constructed an argument, which began with the proposition that the Passover was a true sacrifice for sin, and terminated in the conclusion that the Lord's Supper, being both its substitute and antitype, was also a sacrifice for sin. A conclusive reply to this argument might have been found in two suggestions. So far as the question turns upon the fact that the Lord's Supper is a substitute for the Passover, it is an established principle that one ordinance of worship may take the place of another although they differ in manner and form as widely as baptism differs from circumcision, and the offering of prayer from the burning of incense. And, so far as the question turns on the fact that the Lord's Supper is an antitype of the Passover, the quality of sacrifice which was in the Passover can not appear in the Lord's Supper, for the reason that since the death of Christ there remains no more sacrifice for sin. Heb. vii : 27, ix : 28. But the Protestant theologians, not content with this reply, attempted to cut short the debate by denying, out and out, the sacrificial character of the Passover ; and even to this day, traces of this opinion occasionally appear in the writings of approved divines. But this opinion can not be maintained

except in opposition to the concurrent testimonies of the Scriptures. In the first place, the Passover is repeatedly called a sacrifice. It is described in Ex. xii: 27, as the "sacrifice of the Lord's Passover;" in xxxiv: 25, as "the sacrifice of the feast of the Passover;" in Num. ix: 7, as "an offering of the Lord;" and in Deut. xvi: 2-6, equivalent expressions are four times employed. Next, after the building of the tabernacle, the paschal lamb was, by divine command, to be slain only at the place where sacrifice might be offered. Deut. xvi: 4, 5; Ezra vi: 20. Further, both the blood and the fat of the paschal victim were offered by the priest on the altar, according to the invariable law of atonement. 2 Chron. xxx: 15, 16; xxxv: 11, 14. Further still, Paul puts into the same category the slaying of this lamb and the death of Christ: "For even Christ, our Passover" (our paschal lamb, Mark xiv: 12), "is sacrificed for us." 1 Cor. v: 7. Finally, in both Philo and Josephus the ceremony is styled *θυσια* and *θυμα*, an expiation for sin. Compare *θυσειν* in 1 Cor. v: 7. Nor do the particulars wherein it differed from other forms of sacrifice invalidate its title to a place among them. The imposition of hands, the service of the Aaronic priesthood, the sprinkling of the blood and the burning of the fat on the consecrated altar were omitted from the first Passover; but it is to be remembered that neither the regular priesthood nor the brazen altar were, at that time, in existence. The attitudes of the worshipers, eating the flesh of the lamb in haste, with girded loins, their feet in sandals, and leaning on their staves, were peculiarities which were laid aside after the exodus; the use of unleavened bread and bitter herbs were peculiarities which became permanent in the ordinance. But these incidents, whether permanent or transient, did not deprive the Passover of its sacrificial character—they simply determined it to be a sacrifice of a particular class.

This festival was, moreover, appointed to be the standing commemoration of past deliverance and the type of a future salvation. As a memorial of the past it was observed annually, with the utmost solemnity, through all the ages of the Jewish commonwealth. There were three feasts of convocation, at which all the Jews were required to assemble at Jerusalem; and of these the Passover was the chief. Not only

so, but the day of the festival was marked in the calendar as the beginning of the ecclesiastical year. Ex. xii: 2. This arrangement gave to the Hebrews a double computation of time. The civil year was reckoned from September or October, and the ecclesiastical from March or April; not unlike the method in use in this country, whereby important state papers bear two dates, one running with the vulgar era, and proceeding from the first of January, and the other governed by the Declaration of Independence, and beginning with the fourth day of July. The Jews were required not only to keep the feast, but to perpetuate in the memory of all their generations the great events from which it took its origin. "It shall come to pass when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? that ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians and delivered our houses." Ex. xii: 26, 27. They were commanded to eat unleavened bread, and indeed to allow no leaven to be found in their houses for seven days, in remembrance of the haste with which their fathers came out of the land of Egypt. Deut. xvi: 3. With bitter herbs were they to eat the flesh of the roasted lamb, in memory, as is commonly supposed, of the hard and bitter bondage from which they were delivered. Ex. i: 14. The festival was, therefore, an enduring monument of the past, a great ordinance of redemption.

But its prospective import was more remarkable; since the things which it foreshadowed were better far than those which it commemorated. The matter of the ordinance was a lamb; the lamb was without blemish; it was slain; it was slain by way of a sacrifice; not a bone of it was broken; and the flesh was eaten by the people of God assembled for the purpose. All this was done, moreover, in memory of a wonderful act of redemption of which God was the author, his chosen seed the subjects, and sprinkled blood the token and the price. This redemption was, still further, two fold, a salvation of the first-born of Israel from the destruction of the first-born of Egypt, and a deliverance of the whole body of the church from its house of bondage. Well might the apostle expound and sum up the whole transaction in those few and weighty words: "Christ our Passover was slain for us." He who can not see

Christ, and him crucified, foreshown in the Passover, could hardly be expected to discern the Lord's body in the sacrament of the Supper.

The terms in which the Passover is described in the Pentateuch conclude directly to the proposition that the ordinance was a sacrament; one of the two sacraments of the Abrahamic covenant. Circumcision was the first in order and was appointed at the giving of the covenant itself. Four hundred and thirty years had elapsed since that memorable transaction; nearly two hundred years had passed since the Almighty made any communication of his will to the chosen seed, whether by vision, by covenant, or by oral revelation; and for nearly a hundred years they had been enslaved and polluted likewise by the heathen. When Jehovah came to the rescue, and the church took to itself power from on high to emerge, as a great nation, from its bondage in Egypt, it pleased God not only to remember his covenant, but to institute a new sign thereof in the form of a second sacrament. The relation of the rite to the Abrahamic covenant is immediate; for, although, like circumcision, it was adopted into the Mosaic institutes, it is older than the Sinaiatic covenant, the Levitical priesthood, and the ceremonial law; it pertains, therefore, to the former covenant. It was a new and further act of worship added to the initiatory rite of circumcision.

The mode of determining whether a particular ordinance is a true sacrament is somewhat circuitous. The Scriptures contain neither the term sacrament nor its equivalent, nor do they define the ordinance itself. The theologians have framed a definition by beginning with the proposition, which is universally accepted, that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are true sacraments. Then by comparison and analysis they have ascertained the properties which are common to these two ceremonies, and which distinguish them also from all other divine ordinances; and out of these elementary ideas they have constructed the definition. The application of this definition to any act of worship, the sacramental character of which is under consideration, terminates the inquiry. Now, the sacramental character of the Passover is to be recognized, first, in the fact that the ordinance was of divine appointment, in the absence of which no observance can be a true sacrament.

Next, the two parts which are essential to every sacrament, namely, the outward visible sign and an inward grace signified thereby, are found in the Passover. The lamb killed, roasted, and eaten with unleavened bread, was the sign. Deliverance from the destruction of the first-born and from bondage in Egypt, was the immediate blessing represented; but redemption from sin by the blood of Christ was the spiritual grace signified and exhibited in the ordinance. Moreover the ministers of the sacrament were divinely appointed; in Egypt the head of the family, and in the final form of the ritual, the priest jointly with the master of the household. Still further, the truths set forth in the symbols are those which are proper to a sacrament. The killing and roasting of the lamb conveyed the idea of an offering made for sin, by the knife and by fire. Its body laid on the table, unbroken and entire, represented the unity of the chosen seed and their communion with God in the sacrificial feast; bitter herbs represented not only their bondage in Egypt, but their own desperate guilt in serving the gods of the heathen. Leaven was the product of incipient corruption, and the symbol of lurking, inbred depravity; and was, therefore, to be put away from the feast and from their houses also. Ex. xii: 15; Lev. ii: 11; Mark viii: 15; 1 Cor. v: 6-8. The burning of what remained after supper—the giving it back to God by fire—indicated that this was not an ordinary meal, nor an ordinary sacrificial feast, but that the flesh of the lamb was set aside from a common to a sacred use. Finally, the gracious affections, proper to a true sacrament, were demanded in the right observance of the Passover. Repentance for sin, represented by the bitter herbs; the putting away of all inworking corruption, represented by the exclusion of the leaven; a joyful sense of union and communion with God, awakened by feeding on the unbroken body of the lamb; and above all, a living faith in the Coming One, the Lamb of God, evidently set forth in the paschal sacrifice: these all were affections suitable to the observance.

This demonstration of the sacramental character in the Passover points distinctly to the Lord's Supper as the rite which has taken its place in the Church. There is a close resemblance in the externals of the ordinances. Both were

instituted a few hours previous to the events which they were respectively appointed to commemorate. Both are festal, social, and symbolical. Each sustains similar relations to its fellow-sacrament; none but the circumcised might come to the Passover, none but the baptised may approach the Lord's table. The Supper, like the Passover, is, by express warrant of Scripture, to be often repeated. 1 Cor. xi: 26. Baptism, on the other hand, following the analogy of circumcision, may not be administered to any one the second time, because both Sacraments, the old and the new, were appointed to be signs of regeneration which can occur but once. The Christian and Jewish Passovers are alike, moreover, in their intimate nature. Both are historical monuments of a great redemption; both are prophetic institutions, the Passover foreshadowing the first coming of Christ, and the Lord's Supper his second coming. The Lord Jesus, slain for sin, was set forth in both; in the old sacrament by the lamb, in the new by the bread and the wine. The sacramental actions in the two are the same—the communicants feeding on the flesh of the lamb in the first, and in the second on the symbols of the body and blood of Christ. Repentance for sin, a joyful faith in the saving efficacy of Christ's blood, and a lively sense of union and communion with God and all the Saints, are the graces suitable to the one and to the other.

Their historical relations lead to the same conclusion. It was while Christ and the disciples were eating the Passover that the Lord's Supper was instituted. The Saviour took the materials that he found on the paschal table, and set them apart as the elements in the new sacrament. Before him was the unleavened bread, the memorial of the afflictions of the church in Egypt and its escape therefrom; this bread he took, saying, "This is my body." Before him was the paschal lamb; its blood had been shed in expiation for sin under the provisions of the Old Covenant; he took the wine and said: "This cup is the *New Covenant* in *my* blood." Thus the feast, that began as the Passover, terminated, by a gentle and beautiful transition, in the sweeter and holier solemnity, as the morning brightens into the perfect day. It is impossible, perhaps, to gather out of the Talmuds and the other conflicting Rabbinical authorities, any certain knowledge of the

ritual of the Passover in the time of Christ. But a comparison of the authorities shows that several cups of wine, perhaps three, perhaps five, were drunk during the meal, and served to mark its progress. This circumstance explains the two cups described in Luke xxii: 17-20; the one in verse 17 was, probably, the first Passover cup; and that in verse 20, the third in order, was adopted by the Lord as the sacramental cup. The master of the paschal feast took the unleavened bread and "blessed it," in a prayer of consecration; then he brake it, saying: "*This is the bread of affliction which our fathers did eat in the land of Egypt.*" According to one tradition, he then took a piece of the broken bread, wrapped it in bitter herbs, and ate it; according to another tradition, he distributed the broken bread among the communicants; the whole showing how close are the analogies of the old and the new sacraments in their respective forms, and even in the words of institution. The cup of wine used at the festival, after the roasted lamb was eaten, was called the cup of benediction, a circumstance which explains, Luke xxii: 20: "Likewise he took the cup *after supper*;" and 1. Cor. x: 16: "The *cup of blessing* which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" The smaller Hallel, or selections from the Psalms of David, was chanted during the feast, and at its close the greater Hallel was sung ending with the grand chorus of Psalm cxxxvi, "O give thanks unto the God of heaven, for his mercy endureth forever." In like manner at the close of the Lord's Supper, "they sang a hymn and went out." These traditions, so far as they are worthy of credit, concur with the statements of the New Testament, in showing that the Lord's Supper was both a supplement, and in the intention of Christ, a substitute for the Passover. His own remarkable explanation of it all was: "I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom." Matt. xxvi: 29. These words are commonly supposed to describe the fellowship in heaven between Christ and his disciples. But a simpler interpretation refers them to the change then made in the holy ordinances of the church. They taught the disciples that the wine, now that the Kingdom of God was nigh at hand, should from that time forth disappear as the wine of

the Passover, and reappear as the wine of the Lord's table; and that the sacrament itself had, on that memorable night, put off its old and assumed its new and higher form.

Not only the Passover, but several of the Mosaic Institutes, derived their origin from the destruction of the first-born. The Levitical priesthood is one of these. In the primeval period each worshiper offered gifts and sacrifices at his own separate altar, as is indicated in the story of Cain and Abel. Subsequently, the office of priest was in the head or patriarch of the family, as appears from the biography of Noah, Job, Abraham, Melchisedec, and others. During the Egyptian period the ordinance of sacrifice was held in abeyance by the intolerance of the heathen. Ex. viii : 26. At the exodus, God made provision for a sacerdotal order, by setting apart for that purpose all the first-born males of the twelve tribes. The original ordinance is in these words: "Sanctify unto me all the first-born, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast; it is mine." Ex. xiii : 2. This ordinance is further explained thus: "All the first-born are mine; for on the day that I smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt, I hallowed unto me all the first-born in Israel, both man and beast; mine they shall be. [I am the LORD]." Num. iii : 13. By force of this law the first-born male, both of man and of beast, were divinely reserved for the service of the altar; the former as the priest, the latter as the victim. The fundamental principles of the arrangement were the establishment of a distinct sacerdotal order; the divine selection and vocation of its members; their strictly representative character, and their consanguinity with the people whom they were to represent at the altar.

The designation of the first-born to the office was, however, merely provisional. The germs of some further development of the system were introduced into the original ordinance. In Ex. xiii : 13, a rule is laid down by virtue of which a first-born son a month old might be released from the service. The price of this release was afterward fixed at five shekels. Num. xviii : 16. This process, called the redemption of the first-born, made it certain that some important modification of the plan was contemplated by the Almighty; for he would hardly allow the perpetuity of the priesthood to rest

on the caprices of parents respecting the profession into which their first-born sons should enter. And in point of fact, within six months thereafter the law was amended. By the command of God, at Sinai, Aaron and his sons were set apart to the priesthood; and shortly afterward the males of the whole tribe of Levi, to which Aaron belonged, were chosen for the service of the tabernacle in the place of the first-born of the twelve tribes. The circumstances under which this change was effected are stated in the record. The barbarity of the patriarch Levi, in the slaughter of the Shechemites, described in Genesis xxxiv, induced Jacob, when he was dying, to exclude the tribe of that son from any separate inheritance in Canaan. Gen. xlix: 7. At the exodus, therefore, the descendants of Levi set out for a country, in which, as yet, they had no promise. When, however, the people worshipped the molten calf at Sinai, the disinherited tribe flew to arms at the call of Moses, rallied under the standard of Jehovah, and slew three thousand of the idolaters. In acknowledgment of their piety and patriotism, they were raised to the dignity of the holy tribe. Ex. xxxii: 25-29; Deut. xxxiii: 8-10. According to a census taken at the time, it appeared that there were 22,273 first-born males in the twelve tribes, and 22,000 males, both first-born and after-born, in the tribe of Levi. Jehovah ordered 22,000 of the former to be exchanged for an equivalent number of the latter; and required, moreover, the excess of the first-born in the twelve tribes, that excess being 273, to be redeemed at the rate of five shekels each, the redemption money to be deposited in the treasury of the sanctuary. By this proceeding, Jehovah took the Levites, instead of all the first-born of the children of Israel, for himself. Aaron and his sons, through all generations, held the priesthood, and the Levites in perpetual succession, discharged the inferior offices of the sanctuary. Num. iii: 12-51, viii: 16-18. In the settlement of Canaan, the family of Aaron received neither part nor lot in the land, but the Lord was their inheritance. Num. xviii: 20. To the Levites the tythes of all Israel, together with forty-eight cities, distributed throughout Palestine, were assigned; whereby ample provision was made for their support, and at the same time, the forfeiture announced, two hundred and fifty

years before, in the prophecy of Jacob, was enforced: "I will divide them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel." Gen. xlix:7.

Kurtz, and apparently Fairbairn are of the opinion that the elevation of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood had no connection with the sanctification of the first-born described in Ex. xiii. It is doubtless true that the appointment of Aaron antedated by a few days the heroism of the Levites in the punishment of the idolaters; but the language used in Deut. xxxiii: 8-10, shows that the vocation of Aaron was in anticipation of that event. His appointment to the priest's office, and the appointment of his tribe to the inferior duties of the sanctuary, are therefore to be referred to the same historical origin, and that origin is to be traced immediately to the pious zeal of the tribe at Sinai, and remotely to the sanctification of the first-born.

Not only ministers, but victims likewise for the altar, were provided in the passing over of the first-born of Israel. The first-born of cattle as well as of man among the Egyptians were slain; therefore God consecrated to himself the first-born of the cattle belonging to the Israelites. "It is mine," said Jehovah. If it was a male animal of the clean kind, as of oxen, or sheep, or goats, it was to be brought to the altar; Num. xviii: 17; if of the unclean kind, as the foal of an ass, it might be redeemed by a lamb, or its neck broken, at the option of the owner. Ex. xiii: 13. There is but little doubt, moreover, that the ordinances by which God reserved to himself the first fruits of the earth in every kind, took their origin from the same signal deliverance, and were intended to carry out the principles involved in the sanctification of the first-born. Ex. xxii: 29, 30.

The memory of the same event was perpetuated in another provision of the Mosaic institutes—the redemption of the first-born. The arrangement whereby the first-born males of all Israel were exchanged for the entire male population of the tribe of Levi, did not supersede the earlier ordinance which required the first-born, if taken from the special service of God, to be redeemed by money. It became a perpetual law, and through the ages, when the first-born son was a month old, the parents brought five shekels, as redemption money, so called, to the sanctuary. The usage stood in all the genera-

tions of Israel as a monument of the grace of God sparing his people while he smote the Egyptians. "And it shall be when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What is this? that thou shall say unto him, By strength of hand the LORD brought me out from Egypt, from the house of bondage; and it came to pass when Pharaoh would hardly let us go (hardened his heart against our going), that the Lord slew all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both the first-born of man and the first-born of beasts; therefore I sacrifice to the LORD all that openeth the matrix, being males; but all the first-born of my children I redeem." Ex. xiii: 14, 15. This usage associated the events in Egypt with the joy of the parents in receiving their own first-born son; it afforded a steady reverence to the sanctuary, while it was not a burdensome tax, it being levied on a family but once, and at a time, also, when the other expenses of the household were comparatively light. The ordinance was in force down to the end of the dispensation. Christ himself was redeemed by his parents as a part of the righteousness which it became them to fulfill in his person. Luke ii: 23. The idea of redemption and the kindred idea of sanctification pervaded the institutes of Judaism throughout and throughout. From the time of Abraham his posterity held the position of a seed first chosen, then called of God. On the night of the Passover a new principle was introduced, in the notion of redemption, and in the further notion of consecration to the service of God. The first-born of both man and beast were redeemed from death by the blood of the paschal sacrifice; on the same night all Israel was redeemed from bondage, and then the ordinance was promulgated, whereby Jehovah consecrated them all to himself. Afterward Jehovah reserved the first fruits of the earth in all their kinds, as the token that every returning harvest and vintage belonged of right to Him. The incessant repetition, year by year, and age by age, of the redemption of the first-born, and of the oblation of the first fruits carried into every family, and into every harvest-field and vineyard, the conception of a signal redemption and a complete consecration. The order of the proceeding was first the divine choice of the people, and then their vocation, in Abraham; next, centuries afterward, their redemption by

blood and their instantaneous consecration to God ; the whole process regulated by a solemn covenant, exhibited in two distinct sacraments, and revealing most distinctly the several stages, one by one, of the election and salvation according to grace. Rom. viii : 29, 30.

Not less clearly is the principle of representation disclosed in all these transactions. According to immemorial custom, the first-born son stood as the representative of the family, clothed with pre-eminence in dignity and power. So sacred was this position that Esau, who sold his birthright, inherited the epithet, "that profane person," as a part of the bargain. Now, the complete rejection of all the families of the Egyptians from the kingdom of God, was set forth in the destruction of their representatives, the first-born sons. When, on the other hand, God spared from death, and then consecrated to himself, all the first-born, both man and beast, among the Hebrews, he proceeded on the same idea of representation, and did in effect set apart the whole people and all their possessions to his service. They are mine, said Jehovah. A similar interpretation is to be put on the statutes requiring the first fruits of the earth to be presented at the door of the tabernacle. Its significance is to be sought, not in the intrinsic value of the sheaf of barley or cluster of grapes, but in the principle conceded in the offering. That principle was of representation again, and it involved the acknowledgment that the whole wealth of the harvest-field, vineyard, olive-yard and fig-orchard were in the first fruits dedicated to God. This idea is exhibited in a still more imposing form in the constitution of the priestly order. "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation," said Jehovah to Israel. Ex. xix : 6. The Hebrews did not compose the entire church of God, but were the representatives of a church to be gathered out of all nations, even as Aaron and his sons were not all Israel, but were the representatives in holy things of all Israel. Through the priests all the families of Israel were blessed ; even so, through Israel, the kingdom of priests, all the families of the earth were to be blessed. Out of this kingdom of priests a special priesthood was created. The entire sacerdotal commonwealth was represented by the tribe of Levi ; this tribe by the priestly family of Aaron ; and

the family of priests by Aaron, the High Priest, and his successors lawfully coming into office. In the High Priest every sacred function belonging to the whole priestly order, to the tribe of Levi, to the whole kingdom of priests, to all the elect of God, reached its earthly consummation. In him all were recapitulated. He bore the names of the twelve tribes on the shoulders of his ephod and on his jeweled breast-plate. More than this, the wonderful law of imputation, by virtue of which the High Priest was required to "bear the iniquity" of the whole congregation, was now revealed and laid upon both priest and people, binding them together. On the great day of atonement he offered up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; and for them also, he ventured, though never without blood, to enter the Holy of Holies. The manner in which these ideas of representation, imputation, and atonement are in the Gospel carried over into the work of the Lord Jesus is most clearly set forth in the epistle to the Hebrews.

Israel left Egypt laden with the spoils of war. When God announced to Abraham the future enslavement of the chosen seed, he added this promise: "That nation whom they shall serve will I judge, and afterward they shall come out with great substance." Gen. xv: 14. The literal fulfillment of this engagement was a necessity, not only of the faithfulness of God, but of the supreme dignity of the occasion, and of the issues involved in the exodus. Nothing could have been more inappropriate as a conclusion of the wonders wrought in Egypt, nothing more unsuitable to the character of the God of Israel, than the escape of the Hebrews after the manner of an immense gang of fugitive slaves, a ragged, starving rabble of mendicants. They were not lazzaroni; they were not a mob of routed and panic-struck Arabs; they were the heirs of the covenant, a redeemed church, God's own son, even his first-born. A future of consummate glory was before them. Prophets, kings, and priests, together with the Lord Jesus, in whom the illustrious offices held by them all, were to obtain their consummate expression, were borne in their loins, and the whole company of the elect was represented in their assembly. Their departure from Egypt was in keeping with their position and destiny. "They went out with

a high hand" (openly, boldly), "in the sight of the Egyptians." Num. xxxiii: 3. More than this, "they went up harnessed," armed, or equipped for battle. Ex. xiii: 18. Not only so, but they clothed their sons and daughters with the best spoils of war, even "jewels of silver and jewels of gold and raiment." Ex. iii: 20-22. They marched out of Egypt in magnificent array, a victorious, not a retreating, army—a festal procession compassed about with songs of deliverance.

The value of the treasures taken from the Egyptians may be estimated from the contributions subsequently made by the Hebrews, first to the support of idolatry and then to the service of God. The calf worshiped at Sinai was molten out of the golden ear-rings worn by the people. The amount of precious metals used in the preparation of the tabernacle and its furniture was almost incalculable. For reasons which are obvious to those who have reflected upon the ignorance, degradation, idolatry, and polytheism of both the Hebrews and the heathen, it was needful that the sanctuary and priesthood should be clothed with a transcendent outward splendor. The tabernacle itself was necessarily diminutive in size, in order that it might be taken down and borne about like a tent, from place to place. It was only thirty feet long, ten wide, and fifteen high; not so large as the parlor in many modern dwelling houses. What was wanting, therefore, in a lofty and imposing architecture, was supplied by the magnificence of its decorations. It could not be invested with the grandeur of the cathedral, but it might wear the beauty of a gem; and so address through their senses and captivate the hearts of a rude and sensuous race. The spoils which the Hebrews brought out of Egypt, together with their own proper wealth, supplied the materials for the structure. At the call of Moses the men and women brought "holy garments, and bracelets, and ear-rings, and rings, and tablets, all jewels of gold;" "and every man with whom was found blue and purple, and scarlet and fine linen, and goats' hair, and red-skins of rams, and badgers' skins, brought them"—together with "silver and brass." Ex. xxxv: 21-24. The profusion with which these treasures were lavished upon the building and its appointments, is fully set forth in the twenty-fifth and thirty-seventh chapters of Exodus. The foundation was of silver, the walls

were plated without, and coupled together with gold; the crown of the altar of incense, and of the table of shew-bread, and their bowls and rings, were of gold. The mercy seat and the overshadowing cherubim, were of beaten gold. The candlestick, together with its seven branches, was made of "gold, pure and beaten," of a talent, or ninety pounds in weight. The amount of the precious metals used about the edifice was twenty-nine talents and seven hundred and thirty shekels of gold, and a hundred talents and seventeen hundred and seventy-five shekels of silver. Ex. xxxviii : 24, 25. Arbutnot, whose tables of ancient weights and measures are relied on in England as accurate, estimates the shekel of silver at fifty cents, the talent of silver at \$1,505.62, the golden shekel at \$8.63, and the golden talent at \$24,309. Upon this computation the aggregate of both metals, used upon the building and its furniture, reached nearly a million of dollars. Eisenschmidius reduces the estimate to \$800,000, and Michaelis to about \$315,000. Bœckh, a distinguished German scholar, has recently investigated the subject anew; and his unwearied industry in collecting and sifting all the knowledge pertaining to the subject, in the possession of mankind, has given to his treatise the authority of a standard. He reduces the estimate of Arbutnot by about eight per cent. only. To this are to be added the embroidered curtains of the tabernacle, the rare and costly jewels set in the breast-plate of the high priest, the brilliants worn on his shoulders, and the munificent gifts in gold and silver plate offered by the twelve princes at the dedication. Still another element, though of uncertain significance, must enter into the calculation; the relative value, to wit, of the precious metals in the days of Moses and at the present time. These values are perpetually changing from month to month; but it is an opinion universally received, that they have depreciated many fold, as the supply has increased, during the progress of ages. Dr. Jahn states that their value in the fourth century before Christ, was to their value in England in A. D. 1780 as ten to one. The ratio, in the problem, between the sixteenth century before Christ and the present time can not be less; in point of fact it must be greater. If now the estimate of only one million and a quarter of dollars be put on the treasures at the tabernacle; and if, furthermore, that esti-

mate be increased by a moderate formula representing the depreciation of the precious metals during the run of thirty-five centuries, the sum total must be reckoned by many millions. The whole narrative exhibits at once the wealth and luxury of Egypt, the immeasurable value of the spoils taken thence by the Hebrews, and the sacred purposes to which these spoils were applied. Indeed, the tabernacle stood for five hundred years, first in the wilderness, then in Canaan, a memorial of the night in which the fathers came out of Egypt "with great substance."

The means by which the Hebrews obtained possession of these immense treasures are commonly supposed to present one of the difficult problems of biblical history. According to the English version, the Hebrews "borrowed" and the Egyptians "lent" the jewels. The question of morals involved in the transaction, so far as the Israelites alone were concerned, might be summarily dismissed. For, the charge of fraud might be left, without much compunction, at the door of a generation whose carcasses, for their disobedience, fell in the wilderness. But the record states, in terms, that Moses directed the people to borrow the jewels, and, furthermore, that he gave this order in obedience to the divine command. In Gen. xv: 14, God made promise to Abraham that his seed should come out of Egypt with great substance. In Ex. iii: 20-22, the promise assumes a specific form: "when ye go, ye shall not go empty; but every woman shall borrow of her neighbor, and of her that sojourneth in her house, jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and raiment: and ye shall put them upon your sons, and upon your daughters: and ye shall spoil the Egyptians." In Ex. xi: 1-3, it appears as a divine command. Jehovah said to Moses: "Speak now in the ears of the people, and let every man borrow of his neighbor," etc. Once more, in xii: 35, 36, the original promise and the subsequent command are carried over into action by the Hebrews, who borrowed, and the Egyptians, who lent, the jewels. The case as here made, is supposed by the skeptics to leave the inspiration of the Pentateuch, the integrity of Moses and the character of God himself in a predicament which calls, not for defense—that is pronounced impossible—but for suitable apologies. Those who have undertaken the defense have, until

recently, proceeded on the assumption, accepted so readily by the skeptic, that the transaction was, in the real nature of it, an act of borrowing and lending. They have dealt with the problem, as so stated, after various methods.

The traditional solution is found in the doctrine of divine sovereignty. Calvin says: "There is no need of weighing the judgment of God by ordinary rules, since we have already seen that all the possessions of the world are his, to distribute them according to his pleasure." It is undoubtedly true that God is the sovereign proprietor of all things; and may, of perfect right, transfer earthly possessions from one to another. But this explanation overlooks the main difficulty, to wit: the fraud by which the transfer was effected. For the same reason Pfeiffer's defense is insufficient, which is to the effect that the Israelites borrowed the property with the intention of returning it, but were afterward directed by the Almighty to retain it as their own. Nor are these explanations strengthened by the remark of Augustine, which is that the command was such as ought to be obeyed, not canvassed. To this the reply must be, that the command appears to involve the rectitude of God, and the foundation of the higher command: "Be ye holy, for I am holy." Nor do those solve the difficulty who hold that God has a right to suspend the laws which regulate ownership in property, because the real question at issue here is of the law of eternal and immutable morality.

Other solutions have been found in the peculiar relations existing between the parties. Tertullian and Grotius resort to the doctrine of reprisals, under which, as they contend, the Hebrews were justifiable in repaying themselves, as best they could, for their unrequited labors in Egypt. But it is obvious that they were not at liberty to seek relief, even if they were fully entitled to it, by an act of fraud and falsehood. If a man be robbed he may not rob back. Justi rests the propriety of the proceeding on the supposition that the Hebrews left behind them houses, lands, and other fixed property of great value, in exchange for the treasures which they took away. But, according to the statement of the case, it was a matter of borrowing and lending, not of bargain and sale. Besides this, the women "borrowed jewels of their neighbors;" how

were the lenders, without failure or exception, to get possession of the property left by the Israelites?

A third mode of explanation proceeds from the bad faith chargeable on the Egyptians. Michaelis is of opinion that the Hebrews borrowed the treasures for use at the festival in the wilderness; that they expected to return to Egypt; but the pursuit, which Pharaoh set on foot, in violation of his agreement, released them from all obligation, either to go back themselves, or to return the property. To this the reply may well be, that the Israelites did not expect to go back, else why did they carry with them the bones of Joseph for burial in Canaan? Nor did Pharaoh expect them to return; for, if so, why did he pursue them? A modification of this line of defense is that the Hebrews became an independent nation at the exodus; the Egyptians wantonly made war on them; and, therefore, the Hebrews, by virtue of their rights as belligerents, were absolved from their obligations as borrowers. This explanation is tenable only by those who say with them of old time, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy;" that among the rights of belligerents is exemption from the inward sense of both honor and shame; and that a merchant may, in time of war, repudiate debts contracted with the private citizens of the adverse state in time of peace. Historical justice will hardly impute such knavery to the Hebrews, recreant as they were; and to charge the Almighty with conniving at such practices, is a kind of Atheism.

The true determination of the question is to be recognized in the meaning of the Hebrew words, incorrectly translated by "borrowed" and "lent," in the common version. The words are *Shahal*, in the Kal conjugation, and *Hishael*, in the Hiphil or cause-form of the same verb; and they should be rendered by *asking* and *giving*. The proof of this statement is ample. The word *Shahal* occurs one hundred and seventy-one times in the Hebrew Scriptures. Its ordinary use may be seen in such places as these: "Ask of me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance." Psalms ii: 8. "Now, then, behold the king whom ye have *desired*." 1 Sam. xii: 13. "And God said to him (Solomon) because thou hast *asked* this thing, and hast not *asked* for thyself long life, neither hast *asked* riches for thyself, nor hast *asked* the life of thine enemies;

but hast *asked* for thyself understanding," etc. 1 Kings iii : 11. The absurdity of rendering the word by borrow in these places, is sufficiently glaring. There is but one place, besides Ex. xii : 35, 36, in which *Shahal* occurs in both Kal and Hiphil. Hannah said of her son Samuel, "The Lord hath given me my petition which I have *asked* (*Kal*) of him, therefore, also, I have *lent* (*Hiphil*) him to the Lord; as long as he liveth he shall be *lent* to the Lord." 1 Sam. i : 27, 28. The word is here also improperly translated; because the act of Hannah was in no sense a lending, but an unconditional consecration of her son to the service of God. Finally, there are but two instances, out of the one hundred and seventy-one, in which *Shahal* is correctly rendered to borrow. "If a man shall *borrow* aught of his neighbor," etc. Ex. xxii : 14. "Alas! Master, for it was *borrowed*." 2 K. vi : 5. In these places, the word takes a very unusual meaning, in obedience to the inexorable law of the sentence-form.

If the question arise as to the inducements leading the Egyptians to part voluntarily with the jewels at the request of the Hebrews, the answer will be complete. First, "the Lord gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they lent (gave) unto them such things as they required." Ex. xii : 36. Comp. Ex. iii : 21. Next, "the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh's servants, and in the sight of the people;" which is assigned as a leading motive with the Egyptians in the transaction, at Ex. xi : 3. Further, the asking and giving took place on the night of the destruction of the first-born. The terrified and wailing Egyptians rose up in a body, and, in a manner, drove away the Israelites. They "were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We be all dead men." xii : 33. Their cry would very naturally be: "Begone, quickly; take bracelets and rings, and tablets of gold; take raiment; take what you will; take all, and go at once; we are all dead." Thus the people "spoiled the Egyptians." They went forth, not as borrowers, abusing the credulity of their enemies, but conquerors, laden with the trophies of war.

If a further question arise as to the origin of the mistranslation, the answer may be given in a few words. It was first

admitted into the Septuagint, thence it passed into the Latin version of Jerome, and was adopted by the Vulgate. The Latin fathers, the theologians of the middle ages, and the divines of the Reformation, were, for the most part, ignorant of the Hebrew tongue. They received as correct the traditional reading contained in the Vulgate; and having thereby surrendered the question to all the hazards entailed upon it by the mischievous blunder, they were left to deal with the terms borrowing and lending, as best they could. It is only since the church began to appeal to the Hebrew text, which "was immediately inspired of God," that the matter has been put into its proper light.

In order to complete this study it will be necessary to consider some of the difficulties which are supposed to beset the narrative of the exodus. These difficulties, long since solved by biblical scholars, had passed out of sight until they were reproduced by Bishop Colenso, in his recent attack on the Pentateuch. He finds a stumbling stone, for example, in the institution of the Passover. He assumes that the Hebrew population of 2,000,000 were distributed over a territory as large as the English county of Hertfordshire. He then alleges that, according to the record, the Hebrews received only a twelve hours' previous notice of the destruction of the first-born. Between sunset and sunrise, therefore, the complicated ordinance of the Passover was made known and fully explained to a population as large as that of London; a hundred and fifty thousand paschal lambs were procured, killed, and roasted; the jewels all borrowed; the cattle, estimated at two millions in number, were collected; the movable property of the Hebrews packed up, and all things put in readiness for the march. Such, the Bishop declares, is the substance of the narration. To this the answer is, first, that according to Ex. xii: 3, the people had at least four days' instead of twelve hours' notice; for they were directed to select the paschal lamb on the tenth day of the month, and to kill it on the fourteenth. More than this, they had sixty days' notice, because the nine plagues had extended through that period; these were declared by Jehovah himself to be wrought for the immediate emancipation of the people, and they were attended by constant negotiations unto that end

between Pharaoh and Moses. And, more yet, there is a sound sense in which the Hebrews received notice, running through four hundred years, in the promise to Abraham. Gen. xv : 13, 14. Finally, the cavil hangs upon the brittle thread of a blunder of the Bishop's own, in the interpretation of Ex. xii : 12 : "for I will pass through the land of Egypt this night," etc. He insists that the pronoun "this" designates the very day on which Jehovah was giving directions to Moses as to the Passover, whereas it evidently points to the "fourteenth day of the month" in verse 6 ; just as one might now say, "on the fourth day of July, 1876, on *this* very day, the first century of the independence of America will be completed." Indeed, the same Hebrew pronoun occurs in Gen. vii : 11, and is well translated, in our version, "on the *same* day."

Again, in Ex. xiii : 18, it is written, "The children of Israel went up harnessed (armed) out of the land of Egypt." Colenso asks whence 600,000 men obtained arms, and why was the immense host, if well armed, "sore afraid" when pursued by Pharaoh? Ex. xiv : 10. To the first question the reply may be that the weapons of war, at that time in use, were of the simplest and cheapest kinds, as slings, bows, and javelins, and, therefore, easily obtained ; and, besides, in popular language, the people of a country are said to be in arms, although only a certain portion are actually equipped. To the second question the answer is, that long servitude had exhausted the courage of the Hebrews ; and even brave men might be alarmed at the prospect of a battle if their wives and children, their aged and infirm, were all with them in the camp, having the deep sea in the rear.

The Bishop urges, very strongly, the statistical difficulty exhibited in the exchange of the first-born sons of all Israel for the males of the tribe of Levi. The number of males among the Hebrews is estimated at one million, of whom, as it is stated, 22,273 were first-borns, giving, apparently, about forty-four sons to each family. Num. iii : 43. This problem is solved, first, by the form of the expression in Num. iii : 12, "all the first-born that *openeth* the matrix," which indicates that when the oldest child was a daughter, any son born afterward was not reckoned as a "first-born ;" reducing the ratio one-half. Secondly, the first-born sons, who had families of

their own, would not, it is fair to presume, be counted, but their first-born sons only, or youth under sixteen or eighteen years of age, being about one-third of the whole. This diminishes the ratio to one-sixth, or an average of seven and a third sons to a family. Thirdly, polygamy prevailed to an unusual extent among the Hebrews. 1 Chron. vii: 4. In families where there was more than one mother, the first-born son of the first wife only was, probably, counted. Jacob had four sets of sons, but Reuben alone was acknowledged as the first-born. Gen. xlix: 3. This reduces the ratio still lower. If it be also remembered, fourthly, that the Hebrew women were, at this time, remarkably prolific, the difficulty is fully determined.

The other exceptions taken by Colenso to the historical credibility of the Pentateuch do not fall within the range of this paper. But their validity may be judged by the weight of those which have now been looked into. The author is said to have commenced his public labors by publishing an arithmetic. It is to be hoped that he stated his examples with more accuracy in his "rule of three," than in his specimen of arithmetical theology. In this, certainly, he has not only exposed his mathematics to derision, but his theology also to the stinging aphorism cited by one of his critics, out of Suetonius: "*Negligenter circa Deos, quippe addictus mathematicæ.*"

ART. II.—*The Element of Admonition in the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

WE are liable to lose much of the instruction which the Scriptures might yield us from our faulty methods of reading them. We commonly read them, a chapter here and a chapter there; or, even if we read a whole book in course, yet we take only two or three chapters at a time.

Now, the division of the Scripture writings into chapters, while very convenient for reference, is yet often, as is well known, very arbitrary, so far as the meaning is concerned.

Portions closely connected in sense are often separated into different chapters. It is very difficult, on this account, to read a book of Scripture, a chapter or two at a time, and yet so preserve in our minds the connection of the parts as to receive a proper impression of the whole. The Epistles of Paul are usually very closely connected in sense throughout; as much so as the ablest argument of an advocate or the best considered opinion of a judge. If we take the advocate's printed argument or the judge's opinion, and divide it into a dozen equal portions, and then read one or two portions to-day, and one or two to-morrow, here and there, we shall see how unsatisfactory is the process for ascertaining the full merits of the paper.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is a closely-connected writing, and it needs not only to be studied in its separate parts, but sometimes to be read through at a sitting. The element of teaching in this Epistle, referred to as the theme of this article, is all the more significant and impressive, from its being found to pervade the writing and to constitute one of its essential features; but this we should hardly perceive or feel, unless upon a view of the book as a whole.

A glance through this book reveals its main drift. It is an argument, addressed to Jews, and intended to convince them of the superiority of Christianity over Judaism. The book opens with a statement and proof of Christ's supreme divinity; it then vindicates from objection the concurrent truth of Christ's humanity; it next shows the superiority of Christ over Moses, the founder of the Jewish polity; it further exhibits his superiority as a Priest over the Levitical priesthood; and then, at much length, it argues the temporary and merely typical character of the Mosaic institutions, and the reality and perfection and enduring nature of the Christian economy, thus establishing the position that the very setting-up of the Christian dispensation does of necessity abolish the Jewish rites—they vanish away, as the morning star disappears in the light of the rising sun.

Such is the main drift of the book. And as an argument addressed to Jews, we can not but greatly admire it, when we search into its deepest meanings and follow it step by step. So thoroughly does it review the whole field of Jewish worship, so

fully does it ascertain and reveal the true nature of the Jewish institutions, so satisfactorily does it dispose of Jewish objections to Christianity, and show that Christianity, in its every feature, is indeed the exact and glorious thing which Judaism itself, as symbolic of it, would have it to be, we are brought to a new and more delighted admiration of the book whenever we freshly examine it. And not only so; not only as a book addressed to Jews do we admire it, but we are ourselves instructed by it; we are instructed in the true nature of the religion of the Bible, whether as depicted in the shadowy representations of Old Testament rites, or as plainly revealed in the doctrine here unfolded concerning Christ's person and work. This book sheds a flood of light on the older Scriptures, while it further teaches, with a fullness and impressiveness nowhere else to be found, the great truth of Christ's divine and priestly mediation. Thus, in its main drift, it is of direct and permanent and universal interest.

Yet we would now call particular attention to the fact, that underneath this main drift of the book, there is another teaching, and one of scarcely less interest or importance. It is a teaching much less observed, and indeed very seldom observed at all, as a pervading element of the Epistle. But there it is, recurring to distinct view, again and again, from the beginning to the end of the book. Step by step, the apostle proceeds with his high argument for the superiority of the Christian dispensation, unfolding its glories and demonstrating its absolute and final character; yet at each step he pauses and interposes words of solemn warning. He drops for a time the argument, and addresses his readers with most earnest admonition. Thus, in the first chapter, we have the argument for our Saviour's supreme divinity. He is the Son of God, the brightness of God's glory and the express image of his person, the maker of the worlds and the almighty upholder of all things, whom all angels are commanded to worship, whom the Father calls God and accounts as equal with himself. But with the beginning of the second chapter it is no longer argument—it is admonition: "Therefore, we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every trans-

gression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward,"—if this was so under the old economy—"how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken," not by angels, but "by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him." The superiority of Christianity over Judaism is thus made the ground of a solemn warning against neglecting its claims.

Looking on in the third chapter, we see that, after Christ's superiority to Moses is demonstrated, the argument again pauses and the admonition is resumed, continuing far into the next chapter: "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God." Take heed lest, under temptation, you reject Christ, as the Hebrews of old rejected Moses, forfeiting God's favor and perishing in the wilderness. In your case, both the danger and the guilt of unbelief are greater than in theirs.

Looking on again into the fifth and sixth chapters, we see that, after Christ's superiority over the Aaronic priesthood is exhibited, there is another pause and a yet more solemn warning. The language is, "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame."

Advancing still further, through the seventh, eighth, and ninth chapters into the tenth, we find that close upon the long argument here furnished for the superiority of the Christian economy, comes the renewed admonition corresponding with the argument, "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy under two or three witnesses; of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace?"

And once again, glancing through the eleventh into the twelfth chapter, we do not fail to find that, after many incitements and encouragements are given to lead a religious life according to the gospel, the admonition is again resumed: "For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words;"—these circumstances, under which the law was given at Sinai, were truly terrible, but they were by no means so grandly solemn as those which gather about the gospel, and into the midst of which you are brought. "But ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better things than that of Abel." Ye have come to all these in the gospel. These are the things which the gospel familiarly reveals, about which it is constantly employed, and into close connection with which it brings its believers—things of heaven and earth, of God and man, of eternity and time—things infinitely more sublime than the mere tokens of Jehovah's presence, on the top of one of earth's mountains. The admonition implied in this statement is then explicitly given: "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him which speaketh from heaven."

Thus, looking through this Epistle, we perceive that the warning first sounded near its beginning, recurs at intervals to the end of the writing. We see that admonition is a pervading element of the Epistle. This may be called its solemn *undertone*, not at once perceived by the casual listener, but becoming perceptible upon our attentive listening, and sounding all the more distinctly and impressively in proportion as we heed it. This is the deep, *rhythmic bass* in the grand harmony of the Epistle, making its music awful in impression.

Let us go to the sea-side. Standing there alone, let us

yield ourselves to the influence of our position. Let us listen to the music of the sea, "those hollow tunes it plays against the land," and soon that music will analyze itself to our ears. First, beneath the sound of the wind, which comes moaning and sighing from afar, will be heard the shrill crackling of the water, as the broken waves, in their last motion landward, send their contents rolling and spreading along the hard sandy beach. This is the *treble* of the music. Then, presently, beneath this, will be heard a lower tone, the sound of washing, washing, as the waters in ten thousand broken parts roll over each other, or roll back upon each other from the land. It is the *tenor* of the preceding treble. Then, beneath all else, will be perceived still another part, giving grandeur to this music. The great body of ocean's waters, roused into motion by mighty storms far out at sea, sends mountain billows landward in chasing flight. Onward they go, all unobstructed, till suddenly a continent unmasks its front, at once to meet and to annihilate them. And it is the sudden and expiring voice of these monster billows, massing themselves against the shore and rending into fragments, whose concurrent groans create the thunder of the sea. There is thus a solemn *bass*, a grand *undertone*, in the harmony of the music of the sea.

Or, let us visit Niagara, and learn the wonders which the Falls possess, as well for the ear as for the eye. Listening, that deafening roar will soon become the music of the cataract. There is no *treble* here, but there is the same sound of washing, washing, as the superficial waters glide over those beneath them; then there is a deeper sound, as the great body of waters tear themselves from the river's bed, and over the rocky edge of the precipice rush to their doom; and then, once more, beneath all, and down, as if about earth's foundations, where the solid rocks meet the descending mass of ponderous waters and cast them back, *there* is Niagara's voice of solemn *bass*, her *undertone*, giving grandeur to her music.

Ah! that *undertone*, in every sublime anthem, played or sung by Nature's many instruments and voices, or by human hands and lips, it may be the part last distinctly recognized, yet when recognized it is the last to be lost from hearing.

There it is evermore, and we hear it sounding on, giving foundation and law and life to all the parts and voices that roll and swell above it.

And conceiving of the divine writing under consideration as an anthem of God's truth, sounded forth for man's salvation, and an anthem of many voices, its undertone of recurrent, solemn warning, seems no less grand, and no less vital to the full force of the music. It is a blessed and majestic truth that our Saviour is the Son of God, clothed with all adorable perfections; and let that truth be proclaimed in song as a *melody* of music worthy of angelic lips. But if the Saviour be thus exalted, what dignity must attach itself to his work. How absolutely necessary must be his work in order to man's salvation, and what a glorious salvation must that be which his work provides, and how great must be the grace which prompted him to provide it—even by the tremendous sacrifice of himself, and then what loss and what guilt must be incurred by those who neglect or despise this salvation. And thus begins the undertone of this music. "O, what great salvation," sounds the delightful melody, "provided by the only and the beloved Son of God!" And the undertone is heard, deeply rolling its words of warning, "Ah, how shall we escape, how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" And so continues the heavenly melody through this sacred writing; of Christ our merciful High Priest, able to succor every tempted soul; of Christ our Eternal High Priest, able to save to the uttermost all who come unto God by him; of the new and living way opened into the holiest of all by the blood of Jesus, through which we draw nigh to God; of a complete and glorious salvation for every humble soul, desiring and trusting in Jesus: thus sings the heavenly melody. Yet, at the same time, and all along, is heard the undertone, sounding louder as it sounds longer, proclaiming the truth that the greatness of God's grace lays man under increased weight of obligation, and that the rejection of his grace calls for a vengeance as sore as the grace is wonderful, and exhorting that we refuse not him that speaketh.

And is it not, we ask, this underlying truth that chiefly makes impressive the truth above it? Is it not the alternate truth which gives evident and deep significance to the princi-

pal truth? Is it not the dark background which brings into light the figures on the foreground? We might revere and extol, with delighted heart, the blessed truth of God's tender compassion, of his forgiving mercy, of his long-suffering kindness, not willing that any should perish; but is it not when we see this truth in contrast with his awful holiness, his strict and eternal justice, his solemn purpose by no means to clear the guilty—is it not *then* that the former truth takes it firmest and fullest possession of our souls? And is it not when, in this Epistle, we see the God of our salvation, in all the glory of his adorable mercies, pouring out the treasures of his heart for our blessing, and longing for our salvation, and yet, at the same moment, hear this declaration, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God," and this, "For our God is a consuming fire"—is it not, *then*, that our souls become burdened with the truth of God's compassions? Is it not the undertone of warning, sounding its low thunder, that profoundly moves our souls with its reverberations?

No doubt the peculiar element of teaching in this Epistle referred to, had a special significance for those Jews, or Jewish Christians, to whom the Epistle was at first addressed. They had heard the gospel preached, and many of them had professedly embraced it; yet they were tempted to renounce their profession, or, if they had not professed Christ, they were tempted to disclaim any interest which they had once felt in the Christian religion. They were tempted to return to Judaism and rest there. That was a religion which, on many accounts, pleased them better than Christianity. So, while the writer of this Epistle endeavors to convince them that the Christian religion is true, that it is the reality of which Judaism was but the shadow, and that it is the only true religion; and while, arraying his matchless arguments for this end, he, at the same time and by the same act, exhibits with wonderful fulness and force the great truths of the gospel; he also interposes the warnings here found, because those exact warnings were specially needed by the persons to whom he wrote, and because the truths which he had exhibited were exactly adapted to enforce such warnings. In their careless preference of Judaism over Christianity, they did not

see how great a salvation that is which the gospel provides; and hence, when the apostle exhibits its greatness as seen in the dignity of Christ's person, he also warns them, "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" So again, the apostle declares that by rejecting Christianity and going back to Judaism, they would re-enact the tragedy of Christ's crucifixion. They would approve the murderous act of their countrymen, who thus declared, "We will not have this man to reign over us." And thus deliberately rejecting Christianity, after they had been enlightened to know its real character, thus crucifying to themselves the Son of God afresh and putting him to an open shame, it would be out of the question for them ever to be saved. Such apostasy would be final and hopeless. So, still further, the apostle shows that as the Old Testament rites had been done away by the sacrifice of Christ, and no longer had any force, those who went back from Christianity to Judaism renounced a reality for a nothing; rejecting the sacrifice of Christ, which was a real atonement, and which turned away the wrath of God, there was for them no sacrifice whatever, there was nothing to come between them and the wrath of God, so that "there remained" only "a certain fearful looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation which should devour the adversaries;" and they were warned that "it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Thus these admonitions had a special adaptation to those who were tempted to renounce Christianity for Judaism.

Yet this special adaptation relates to the *form*, rather than to the *substance* of these warnings. As the principal teachings of this Epistle concerning the person and work of Christ are of universal and perpetual interest, so the warnings which answer to these teachings have a full application wherever men, for any reasons whatever, are disposed to neglect or reject the gospel. And knowing how prone men are to prefer religions of their own to that of the Bible, knowing how ready they often are to go back from the doctrine of Christ the Son of God sacrificed for our sins, and faith in him as the only way of salvation, and to take up the idea of God's general mercy, or of man's goodness, or of the merit of human penances and sacrifices, or of what not?—knowing

this, it is no doubt the duty of the minister of the word frequently to repeat these same warnings, and to urge them as Paul did, by the consideration of the great and gracious things of the gospel. It is the duty of every Christian minister to make these warnings the undertone of all his preaching, even as Paul did of all this Epistle.

The truth needs perpetually to be brought before the minds of all who hear the gospel, that just in proportion to the magnitude of God's mercies to us in Christ Jesus, is the guilt of our neglect, or unbelief, or apostacy. If God had done little or nothing for human salvation, then the guilt had been less which refused his proposals. If men thought they saw better grounds of hope elsewhere, and hence looked elsewhere, it would not have been quite so strange, or sad, or wicked. But how stands the matter in regard to the religion of Christ? How intense the interest which God evinces in this religion! This seems to have the very highest place in his heart. It is not, apparently, so much the happiness of the angelic world, and the worship which angelic hosts continually offer, that engages and delights him, as it is the salvation of perishing men, and the worship of the penitent and broken-hearted of earth.

We look to God's word, and we see that God is everywhere interested there. How clearly he reveals, how fully he explains, how urgently he remonstrates, how tenderly he persuades, plying men at every point with the most powerful motives. There is nowhere in the world a book so much in earnest as the Bible; and all its earnestness has direct relation to the matter of man's salvation. This end—this—by every holy or innocent means, God would compass.

We look further, and we learn the same lesson in seeing what God has actually done for men in his gospel; at what a sacrifice on his part the foundations of human pardon are laid, and the channel for his saving mercy is opened. The declaration may have a familiar sound, but we do not know its full meaning, and we never shall, though we ponder it to eternity, that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life." Here were all gifts which even God could bestow, summed up in one. God had but

one Son, and he did not give him for angels, but sacrificed him for men. In the one gift and sacrifice he poured out all the treasures of his merciful heart, and expended for our salvation all that even God could possibly give, for any object or for all objects combined.

And if this is not enough to illustrate the urgency of the claims of religion, we may look further to the Son of God, and see him coming forth from the Father and veiling himself in flesh, and wearing out and giving up his life in bearing our sins and carrying our sorrows; we may see him as the ever-living Priest of his people, perpetually interceding for them in heaven; we may see him exalted to be head over all things unto his church, and as king over the universe, ordering all things for the progress of his cause, and satisfied only when he sees of the travail of his soul in the justification of many.

And if this is not enough, we may still further look to the Holy Spirit of God, and see him descending from heaven and dwelling in our world of sin; see him engaged continually in his work of moving upon the hearts of men to bring them to the Saviour,—enlightening their darkness, humbling their pride, renewing their wills, strengthening their weakness, striving unweariedly in them against sin, and helping them on to God.

And if even all this is not enough, we may consider still further that complicated apparatus which God has instituted and set in motion for extending and perpetuating his religion. What mean our sabbaths, our sanctuaries, the living ministry, the circulating Bible, the sacraments, the company of God's people—and all these in constant and full employment—what mean they all, if God is not intent upon the salvation of men through the gospel of his Son?

And the question comes, can it be that what thus lies so near the heart of God, and thus employs so fully the energies of God, and thus involves so largely the glory of God,—can it be that this is a matter which men may innocently disregard, or lightly let go for rival interests and claims? Or, rather, do we not perceive again and more clearly, that all the stupendous truths of our religion unite and sing, even on

that undertone which sounds the warnings of the Epistle before us?

God is in earnest in the matter of his religion; how great is the corresponding earnestness which is claimed from men! God has provided and offered a glorious salvation; what zealous seeking and thankful acceptance should it everywhere induce! Those who are habitually indifferent to the religion of the Bible, and treat its claims as of trivial moment, or who frame for themselves religious opinions, or adopt those furnished by others, disliking the religion of the Bible,—such should learn the great lesson of this Epistle; that there is for them no religion save that of the Bible. There is one God, there is one Bible, and there is one religion. There is nowhere to be found a single promise of God made to men apart from the Bible; there is nowhere to be found a single promise of the Bible made to men apart from Christ; Christ has laid the foundation for promise only as the Divine Son of God, by the sacrifice of himself; and the Son of God, given as our Saviour, was the one gift which exhausted the treasury of Heaven. And that this great lesson of the Epistle may have its due impression, the corresponding admonitions of the Epistle must be regarded;—that, apart from this only religion, men can have no hope before God; that, neglecting this great salvation, they can not possibly escape the just reward of their transgressions; that, rejecting the sacrifice which Christ has offered for sin, no atonement is left, and there “remains” only the fearful anticipation of God’s judgment and fiery indignation. This undertone of the music of the gospel men everywhere need to hear, until its resounding thunder fills their souls with salutary dread. While mercy everywhere invites, warning should everywhere urge men to salvation—escaping for their lives, looking not behind them, neither staying in all the plain, escaping to the mountain, lest they be consumed.

ART. III.—*The Peril and Duty of the American People, with Respect to the Foreign Relations of the Country, impending War with England and France, and the threatened Humiliation and Partition of the United States.*

To ALL human observation there is one effectual way, and there is but one, to suppress the rebellion, extinguish the civil war, and restore the country to its former condition. That way is to break, scatter, crush the military power of the Confederate Rebel States, to such a degree that all armed and organized resistance, on their part, will cease. The reason why there is no other way, is simply because the dominant class of rebels in arms will accept of no terms of peace which the American people are willing to grant them; and having sedulously contrived an issue which could naturally result only in their own conquest, or the destruction of the American nation, as it then existed—they have, during two years of frightful war, continually put it more and more out of the power of the mass of the Southern people to force the military despotism, under which they groan, to change that issue. Whatever may have been the wishes of those people, or whatever those wishes may be now, or hereafter, they have no power, no means, of making them known, except through that military despotism, whose destruction, by arms, it is the highest duty of the American people to accomplish.

We do not propose, at this time, to discuss the consequences which would follow the effectual breaking of the military power of the armed rebels. The great result designed by the American people, is the restoration of the Federal Union, and the preservation of the national life and institutions, just as they all were before—or as nigh to that as the uncontrollable circumstances which may then exist, will allow. Nor do we mean to say that the suppression of the rebellion, and the extinction of the civil war by conquest, are conditions precedent to the possibility of peace; for it is too obvious that perils are gathering over the country, both from within and from without—which, unless met with the greatest wisdom and vigor, may make an infamous peace seal, at once, our ruin and our disgrace. But what we mean to say is, that no peace

by which the country can be restored to its former condition is possible, except by means of the military suppression of the rebellion, and the thorough conquest by arms of the rebel forces. We wish, with all our heart, that it were otherwise. We deplore, as we have never deplored any public event, the necessity laid upon the American people, in this behalf. But it is as clear to us, as it ever was, that if any duty ever was incumbent upon any nation or any generation of men, that it is our duty, God helping us, to preserve the life, the integrity, and the institutions of this great nation—and to that end to do all that righteous men, who expect to give account to God, may undertake. Nay, further—we are firmly persuaded that if, by the folly and wickedness of men, and by the inscrutable providence of God, we are not permitted to accomplish, in its obvious way, the great duty set before us; we are bound so to shape events that we shall reap the most signal equivalents for our failure, and that they who interfere to hinder us shall pay a price for their perfidy, which they will long remember, and for which coming ages will bless us.

Considering the relative condition of the parties, and the actual state of the war, there are, apparently, but three ways in which it is possible for the American people to be prevented from accomplishing the work set before them. It is, no doubt, possible that we might fail through the incompetence of those into whose hands the doing of the great work has fallen. We might also fail through the indifference of a great portion of the American people to the work, or even opposition to it, or disgust at it, on the part of sufficient numbers to deprive it of its national character. And we might fail by means of the armed intervention of powerful foreign nations. It is to the consideration of the last of these three methods of obstructing our successful prosecution of this civil war, that this paper is particularly devoted. In the meantime, while we will not discuss, at present, either the first or second class of dangers above distinguished, it is proper to express, in very few words, their special relation to the third class, and our sense of their own general nature.

We have put the case conditionally, in each instance; we *might* fail under the condition stated; we *might not*. It would

depend on the nature and extent of the controlling incompetency, or of the general dissatisfaction—relatively to the national force that could be relied on, and to the rebel force that could be brought into the field and managed well. Both the controlling incompetency and the national dissatisfaction that might exist, has direct and causal relation to whatever foreign intervention might occur: and whatever national dissatisfaction might exist, might have relation, more or less serious, to whatever incompetency might be supposed to exist on the part of the Administration, and the various officers, civil, military and naval, appointed under it. We use the word *incompetency*, in its widest sense—and with relation to the vast work set before the country. And we use the word *dissatisfaction* as applied to the people, with reference—not to the justice or propriety—but to the reality and the danger of such a state of mind on their part—and more especially on the part of the army. If these three things exist together—incompetency on the part of those to whose guidance our affairs are committed—serious dissatisfaction with them on the part of very large portions of the people—and foreign intervention by powerful nations; it is hardly conceivable that the nation could be extricated from the necessity of a ruinous and dishonorable peace, unless by means that, for the time, and perhaps for a very long time, if not in perpetuity, would subvert the existing institutions of the country; for example—a military revolt and dictatorship. The President may rest assured that his own fame, as well as his most pressing and immediate duty, demand the earnest consideration of these things by him. If there is in this nation competent talent, skill, and integrity to carry the nation triumphantly through its perils, he is entitled to its use, and it behooves him to secure it, in every department of the public service. Moreover, the great office he fills can not, under any circumstances, be successfully executed, otherwise than in accordance with the actual public sentiment of the nation itself; and least of all can that be done at a period of infinite public danger, and intense public excitement. He must lay his account, not only with the absolute necessity of having the real force of the nation, as to intellect, skill, and integrity, actually in its service; but with the absolute necessity, also,

of satisfying the public mind, that the fact shall be so. The nation is not satisfied; and its discontent would be respected and removed by a wise President—such as we trust in God Mr. Lincoln may prove himself to be. We do not speak of the discontent of traitors in the loyal States; they are bent on mischief—and so little sense have they, that their own destruction will probably be the first fruits of their success. Nor do we speak of discontent with any particular act of the Administration. But everywhere something is complained of, and every one has some exception to make, some regret to express, some apprehension to whisper. The nation needs to be reassured; and this reassurance needs to come from the center of affairs—from the hight of the Government itself. As to failure—failure is destruction. The nation will not endure it. The army will not endure it; we mean the real army—not the countless deserters—not the cowardly or worthless officers absent without leave, and useless everywhere—not the tens of thousands of sharks, with and without commissions, who plunder the people and the Government alike—blaspheming thieves! Half a million of American soldiers, veterans under arms, constitute a power greater than that of the greatest existing empire. It is possible for them to be destroyed in detail, by incompetent handling; it is possible for them to be prevented from doing anything—where folly, cowardice, or treachery, is intrusted with the control of them; but it is not conceivable that they will ever accept, and divide among them, the ignominy of having taken up arms to save their country, and then laid those arms aside by reason of a disgraceful peace, at a moment when they knew that if they were well commanded there was nothing under the sun that could stand before them. We will say no more, therefore, at present, about the first and second way in which we *might* fail in our endeavors to save our country. The powers which have been conferred on the President by acts of the last Congress, added to those he possessed before, put him in a position to wield the whole physical power, and the whole pecuniary resources of this great nation. We are not of the number of those who would grudge him any power he may constitutionally exercise, or cavil at any constitutional use of it; nor do we call in question his patriotic intentions,

in the use he will make of it. We trust in God the nation will be saved from the first class of perils we have indicated as arising from any serious incompetence, anywhere, in the use of these vast powers; and we earnestly hope the President will dispel the second, by dealing with the public discontent, on the one hand, in the way of vigorous repression of all criminal acts, and on the other hand in the way of wise and patriotic regard to public opinion. Thus, under his lead, by means of a triumphant national demonstration, our internal dangers may disappear; and our foreign relations might settle at once, into safe peace, or open war. Whether peace with all foreign nations, or war with one or more of the most powerful of them, is in our immediate future, is a question which depends on the Federal Administration, in part—upon the choice of foreign nations, in part—and mainly, perhaps, upon the course of events which neither our own, nor any other government, can either completely control, or even foresee. It may, however, be accepted as violently probable, that we shall be obliged to fight either Great Britain or France, or both of them, before our internal difficulties are settled—unless we are able to convince both of those powers that war with the United States is far more dangerous than promising to them. To this extent only, therefore, the Federal Administration can be held responsible for any foreign war that may occur—namely, that it probably would not have occurred if the country had been placed and kept in a condition of complete readiness for it. In connection with what we have further to say, we refer to the views we expressed a year and a half since, when the country seemed to be on the point of war with England.*

We knew a case in which property was devised in trust as a charity for the benefit of the *poor white orphans* of an Episcopal parish in one of our principal cities. The will was contested upon the ground of its uncertainty—seeing, as was alleged, that every term was vague; who is poor, who is white, and who is an orphan, being unsettled, in the intention of the testator. We leave our readers to determine for themselves what the courts should have decided. *Martinus Scrib-*

* *Danville Review*, Vol. I., No. 4, pp. 666-672, December, 1861.

lerus has given a case, with the pleadings and the result. Devised to A all the white and black horses of the testator; there proved to be six black, six white, and six black and white; the devisee A set up a claim to the whole eighteen. Terrible pending, proving, arguing, deciding; the devisee A finally lost all, upon the ground that the whole eighteen were mares. The devisees in the great cases of *Girard* of Philadelphia, and *Macdonough* of New Orleans, were in some respects about as uncertain, in themselves, and as troublesome, to the devisees, the lawyers, and the courts, as the real charity case, or the probably fictitious horse case above alluded to. And we have chosen to illustrate the practical nature of the *Law of Nations*—which concerns us so deeply to appreciate aright—by the practical administration of the *Statutes of Wills*; because the principles of interpretation in the two kinds of law, are the most similar. A will is professedly interpreted according to the *intention* of the testator; the *Law of Nations* is interpreted, as to matters at sea and along the sea coasts, according to the intention of him who is strongest in fleets—and as to matters clearly on land, according to the intention of him who is strongest in armies; for example, the great Napoleon and Mr. John Bull. It is with the latter gentleman, in person, with the case of Mason and Slidell already ruled against us in a way that riled most of us terribly, that we are to settle the *sea* Law of Nations, as he shall please—or fight; and it is with the successor of Napoleon, under his open and insulting avowal that his business in Mexico is to restrain our race, and that his policy requires our dismemberment, that we must settle the *land* Law of Nations, as will please him, or fight. Of course, we will fight them both if they insist on it. And it seems in the highest degree probable, at present, that they will both insist on it, unless we either disgrace ourselves by submitting to terms at once infamous and ruinous—or unless they get to understand that fighting us is neither safe nor profitable—or unless the course of events in the old world may render it particularly inconvenient for them to embark in a great war with the United States.

The attempt to reduce into a *code* the principles and rules by which civilized nations should regulate their treatment of each other, in peace and in war, is altogether modern. Some

very able and enlightened men have spent great labor in these inquiries, and in earnest endeavors to settle, according to true reason, and the law of nature, the numerous and often doubtful problems which they involve. But this code which professes to define the rights and duties of nations with respect to each other, besides that which natural reason lays down among all men, and which the Roman Civil Law declared was the true law of nations; is modified by the imprescriptable customs of the particular nations, and by the innumerable treaties, alliances, compacts, leagues, and agreements which they have made with each other, the principles of which survive and may be pleaded as a precedent, for a good end or a bad one, long after the instruments themselves have ceased to be binding. Moreover, just as the decrees of the Roman Pro-Consuls and Prætors entered into the life of nations throughout that mighty empire; so also the dispatches of great civil and military officers constitute a kind of perpetual commentary on this law that has no tribunal; and the decisions of the greatest judicial tribunals of modern times have interpreted many of these rights and duties of nations, in the light of their own municipal laws. In the daily life of the freest and most civilized people, all manner of devices are necessary, and are resorted to, in order to administer their own written laws, in such a manner as to satisfy the public conscience. As we have seen, wills are interpreted on a peculiar principle; deeds are interpreted upon another peculiar principle (always against the grantor); criminal laws are interpreted strictly; other laws according to their obvious meaning; and then a special jurisdiction is created (chancery) in part to supply the defects, and in part to rectify the evil of mere legal right. And, after all, in the administration of municipal law, with its plain written statutes and its impartial tribunals, and its able counsel, and its eager suitors; what we reach, in every litigated case, is a judgment founded on opposite and conflicting analogies, often so obscure and so subtle, that the most enlightened bystander is wholly uncertain what the judgment ought to be. Never was a nobler or wiser sentiment put into the mouth of a great nation, by one of its greatest heroes and patriots, than this: *We will demand of other nations nothing but what is right, and we will put up with nothing that is wrong.* Let us

immediately put our whole population upon an effective war footing; let us double our navy as soon as possible—and then immediately double it again; let us put our coast defenses, as quick as possible, into the best possible state of defense. These—and not learned dispatches—are the true preparation of our numerous cases under the law of nations, which, first or last, our very good friends, Mr. Bull and Mr. Bonaparte, hold in reserve for us; very forbearingly, no doubt, on their part—that is, waiting for a chance. We have more confidence in a common law-court and jury, than in almost any human tribunal; but, in our experience, which has been considerable, success there requires a good judge, a good jury, a good lawyer, a good cause, good proof, and considerable attention to details. We also have very great veneration for the law of nations—and would not be understood as desiring to implead either Mr. Bull or Mr. Bonaparte before a code, which has seemed in pastime to be the willing agent of England at sea, and of France on the land. But when they hail us there—as they are sure to do—we can not help thinking that our chances of getting honorably and safely through the case, will depend far more on our readiness and ability to maintain it, than on its merits, or their justice. Nor can any considerate nation ever permit itself to forget that it is out of the occurrences of actual war, that nine-tenths of the important difficulties under the law of nations arise; that war is one of the commonest methods of settling the interpretation of that law; and that of all codes of law, that one is the most fruitful of conflicting analogies and contradictory decisions—and therefore of grounds of delusion, and pretexts for violence and wrong. Nor is it improper to add, that of all nations, England and France could each be convicted on the testimony of the other, of having most flagrantly outraged the rights of other nations, and violated their own plain duties to them.

The state of Europe, and by consequence the principles of its public law, and the rules of their application to the relative rights and duties of European nations, have all greatly changed within the last half century. The quarter of a century, from the commencement of the French Revolution in 1789 till the treaty at Vienna, by which Europe, having

triumphed over that revolution, sought to extinguish it; witnessed the habitual and undisguised violation, on land and at sea, of every right and every duty of all nations toward each other—just as their passions or their supposed interests demanded. The treaty of Vienna was, in effect, in the place of the previous public law of Europe, as it had been understood before the outbreak of the French Revolution; and in all subsequent interpretations of that law, every outrage committed by powerful nations during the preceding quarter of a century of almost universal revolution and war, was liable to be pleaded in expounding the treaty which so largely superceded the law of nations by the new public law of Europe. The fifty years almost that have elapsed since the treaty of Vienna, have undone most thoroughly and effectually the work of that European council of nations; and the revolution it made in the public law of Europe has incurred a counter-revolution, not exactly back to the law of nations, but in a direction required by the supposed interests of the great European nations. In the meantime, also, the same half century has witnessed the supercession of the northern powers of Europe by its western powers, as the predominating nations. France, under the Bourbons, and under Louis Phillippe, was hardly felt in Europe during more than thirty years after the treaty of Vienna. England, either repudiating the holy alliance, or repudiated by it, was passing through a great internal change, and slowly recovering from the exhaustion of a great and protracted war. The northern powers, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, by their close union and their great united strength, held the absolute predominance until Louis Napoleon was firmly seated on the French throne. The close recent union of France and England—the immense development of both of these nations—the mysterious and daring policy of France, partly supported and partly tolerated by England—the war of the two with Russia—and then the war of France and Sardinia against Austria, have all resulted, as we have said, in the complete supercession of the northern alliance, by the western alliance, as the controlling European force. It has been said, with almost as much justice as severity, that Russia has been paralyzed, Austria conquered, and Prussia disgraced. While this alliance continues, the public law of Europe is whatever France and England may agree to consider it; and the law of

nations for the sea is whatever England, with the consent of France, may determine; and the law of nations on land is whatever France, with the consent of England, may determine; and in this sense both the public law of Europe, and the law of nations, will be enforced upon all who have not the courage and strength to resist the unscrupulous and savage domination of one or both of these nations. It is well known that these great nations, whose alliance is so dangerous to the independence and repose of all others, are full of mutual jealousy and distrust; and that nothing but their mutual fear of each other and their appreciation of the advantages they may both reap, from a combination which requires so many galling mutual concessions enables their respective governments to maintain, amid constantly recurring difficulties and embarrassments, a mutual good understanding. No one, probably, can venture to say less than that it is liable, at any moment, to be interrupted; that it is the interest of all nations to protect themselves against it; and that, while it continues, there is no outrage beneficial to either party to it, and not injurious to the other party to it, that may not be expected against the rights of other nations. The most important element of the public law of Europe is, perhaps, that which concerns the balance of power among European nations; and the most important element of the law of nations is, perhaps, that which concerns the independence of States, in their security from foreign intervention in their domestic affairs. And yet it would be perfectly easy to show that both France and England, separately and unitedly, since, by their good understanding and their concerted action, they have been able to menace all nations, have habitually aimed at dictation to Europe, and ruthlessly set at naught the independence of nations. At this moment, how is it possible to reconcile the conduct and avowed policy of France in Mexico—or the proceedings and intentions either of England or France with respect to the United States, with the independence of nations, any more than with the faith of treaties, or the peace of the world?

The rights of nations friendly to the United States, and bound to it by treaties, have been distinctly explained, both in England and France, as understood by very high authority in both countries, relatively to the government of this country, and to the rebels in arms against it. They contend, that

besides having a perfect right to interfere by way of friendly advice, with a corresponding obligation on our part, to consider seriously whatever they may propose to us; there are, in addition, three other distinct things which it is perfectly clear they are authorized by the law of nations to do, of which the first two are peaceful, and the third only is a war-like proceeding. Namely, in the *first* place, they might, with perfect friendliness to us, and as bound by the law of nations, extend to the rebels all the rights of a belligerent—that is, of a nation carrying on lawful war; and they might and ought to observe strict neutrality as between the Government of the United States and the comparatively small fraction of our citizens who took up arms at the beginning of this civil war. In the *second* place, now that they are perfectly sure the rebels have already secured, and will maintain, their independence, they may, in the most friendly spirit to us, acknowledge that independence, and enter into treaties of amity and commerce with these rebels; the only decisive consideration being, whether such an act would be for the benefit of their own subjects. In the *third* place, having acknowledged the independence of the rebels, they would be fully justified, at any moment the interests of their own subjects required it, in taking up arms against the United States in maintenance of the rebel independence. To such expositions as these, the English writers, up to the present time, nearly always add the strongest declarations in favor of English neutrality a *little longer*; avowing very plainly as the reason for that conclusion, the apprehension of immediate war with them on our part, which they wisely suppose is not specially advantageous for England. The French declarations do not generally exhibit any special apprehension of war with America; whether because no such result is seriously contemplated, or because it is already resolved on, or because the French do not fathom the real intentions of the Emperor, or that he has not played his American game far enough to determine positively what he should do, we can not pretend to say. The Emperor of the French is a very dangerous ally; but as he makes peace as capriciously as he does war, it is as difficult to appreciate his menace as to trust his promise.

It is not easy to state with calmness and patience, proposi-

tions laid down under the venerable name of law, but full of atrocity and insult; and all the more infamous, when the previous conduct of those who make them, is remembered. Suppose we should *advise* France to bring the Emperor to the guillotine—or *advise* England to strip herself of such of her possessions as she had acquired by fraud and violence?—demanding at the same time the friendly consideration of our advice! Suppose we should remind both of those nations, that the neutrality they both profess to practice, is little else than war in disguise against the United States? Suppose we should prove to them that their oft-repeated assurances that the rebels have acquired, and are able and sure to maintain, their independence, are acts of mere hypocrisy, supported by boundless and baseless falsehoods—known by them to be such? Suppose we should array the evidence before them, that whatever chance of success the rebels ever had, or have now, has resulted from the flagitious conduct of the British and French Governments—and, then, that the results of their own faithlessness have been magnified a thousand fold, attributed to the weakness of the American Government, and made a pretext for their right, under the law of nations, to recognize the independence of the rebels? Suppose we should demonstrate to them that their whole conduct, from their first outrage of eagerly recognizing the rebels as a belligerent nation—on through all their violations of treaties and of the law of nations, in giving the open support of opinion, of public sentiment, and of sympathy, and the secret aid of ships, warlike stores, and implements, necessities of all kinds, immense credits, and protection to the verge of war—up to the hardly concealed menace of early and actual war, has been covered up under pretexts at once false and base—the real motives all the while being dread of the power of the American nation—malignant hatred of its free institutions—and a diabolical and long cherished desire to frustrate its glorious mission among the nations? This, substantially, is our case in meager outline, against Great Britain and France. Does it justify us in considering, or calling them, *friendly nations*? Does it authorize us to place the smallest confidence in their professions of friendship? Does it excuse us for expecting justice, forbearance, or even peace

at their hands? Does it not—on the contrary—warn us to expect, at any moment, war with either England or France, or both of them? Should it not inspire us with redoubled heroism—that we may make that war, when it shall come, an occasion, one way or the other—for there are, as we will show, at least two glorious alternatives—of one of those sublime national triumphs—or one of those immense national retributions—to which only the noblest races have been found competent?

A good deal of stress has been laid upon the sufferings of certain classes connected with the cotton manufacture and trade, both in Great Britain and France; and upon the general derangement of trade and commerce, and the danger to the public finances in both countries, consequent on the failure of the usual supplies of cotton, by way of excusing the conduct of both nations toward the United States. The forms in which the governments of those nations have presented the subject, have been various; sometimes urging the right, if not duty, on their part, to put a stop to useless and uncivilized war in America; sometimes the duty of forcing us to supply Europe with cotton, which has become an article of prime necessity there; sometimes the necessity of putting a stop to a war which furnishes so many occasions of involving other nations in hostilities, with no possibility of advantage to the present parties to it. It will be observed that in whatever way the case is put, the right of foreign interference is always taken for granted, and the termination of the war in the independence of the Confederate States is always assumed as the final necessity. The feeling which actuates both the English and the French, thus manifest in all the acts and utterances of both nations, has been assiduously displayed through the press of both nations, in a manner the most deliberately infamous and insulting that has ever been exhibited by the periodical literature of any age; and this has been more conspicuous in England than in France. An individual, here and there, in both countries, and to a certain degree, a press, should be excepted from this condemnation; but such exceptions—few in number—are generally, if not always, connected with such conditions of their vindication of the United States, or such a method of advocating our

cause, as few enlightened Americans are willing to accept. The alleged recent revolution in public opinion in England, is distinctly founded upon the avowed intention thus to uphold the abolition proclamations of the President, as the condition of English approbation, and is but another phase of the same design to divide America on the slave line, which was organized in England thirty years ago—which has been in alliance with the ultra-abolition movement in America from its origin, and which has been, ever since, one of the prime causes of all our national troubles. The law of nations, as heretofore interpreted by England, means that the independence of China depends on the readiness of that multitudinous people to eat and smoke opium at highly remunerating prices, for the benefit of the English treasury, through the government monopoly of the opium of India. And the same law, as now interpreted both in France and England, means that the independence of America depends upon the prosperity of the cotton trade and manufacture in those two countries. The sufferings of any portion of mankind are to be regretted by good men. But it is time the American people fully understood that these pretended English and French sufferings for lack of cotton, are results of the deliberate policy of their own governments; are, in the main, pure fabrications of the two governments—equally silly and disgraceful to them—and are eagerly used as pretexts for outrages on the part of those governments, determined upon for different grounds. Every one can understand that the course taken by France and England, with respect to the rebellion in America, was the course, of all others, most calculated to cut off the supply of American cotton to the greatest extent, and for the longest time; and that now they have only to follow out that course according to its natural tenor, and bring on war with the United States, in order to make perpetual whatever evils a short supply of American cotton inflicts on their subjects. Among the many gross errors committed by the leaders of the rebels, not the least absurd one was, their confident reliance on the staples of their agricultural industry, especially cotton, as guarantees of their success, through the indispensable necessity of those staples to the great commercial and manufacturing nations. And now England and

France keep up this delusion among the rebels, by the pretence of suffering and ruin, which only cotton can cure, among great masses of their people, every wail from Western Europe being a distinct hint to the Confederate Government that intervention is drawing nearer, and a distinct intimation to hold out to extremity. In the mean time, and in order to enable them to hold out, immense credits are opened for the Confederate Government, upon pledges of cotton, both in France and England, which cotton all the parties understand may never be delivered; but the money thus furnished to the Confederate Government will be claimed from the United States as soon as the Confederacy is conquered; and the enormous interest allowed, added to the conviction that France and England will follow their usual policy, now specially illustrated by France in Mexico, induces capitalists to advance the funds, looking to be paid by the United States under coercion, as the fruit of our success. In whatever aspect our relations with France and England can be viewed, nothing can be more palpable than that those powerful nations do not mean that we shall succeed in this war, if they can prevent it without too great risk; and that if we do succeed, in defiance of them, they mean that our success shall cripple us to the greatest possible degree, and for the longest possible time.

We have already said that whatever incompetency, in the widest sense of that word, may be exhibited, or may appear to foreign nations to be exhibited, by the American Government, must necessarily diminish, in their view, the risk of carrying out completely their settled policy against this country. We have also said, that in whatever degree the dissatisfaction, division, and opposition among the American people, to the actual Administration and its policy, really weakens, or appears to foreign nations to weaken, the power of the nation, will, in the same degree, appear to them to diminish the risk incurred by them in dictating terms to us, and attempting to enforce those terms by war. It is true that foreign nations are liable to make egregious mistakes on both of these points; and it is the part of such great statesmen as we may chance to have in positions where such mistakes may be turned to account, to understand that such mistakes, well

improved, have all the efficacy of the sternest realities. The whole of that aspect of our national affairs, therefore, vast as its import is, presents innumerable contingencies, in dealing with which true greatness in rulers, seconded by true heroism in nations, are the first conditions of triumph and security. In like manner, as we have already said, a state of European affairs may lie behind the action which Great Britain and France might be strongly inclined to take with regard to American affairs, which may also present innumerable contingencies, about which we are as liable to be mistaken, as they are to be mistaken concerning us, but which, nevertheless, may deter those nations from attacking us except in concert with each other; and may, possibly, prevent that concert. Here we enter a field from which our traditional policy has always kept us as far removed as possible—the field of foreign diplomacy—except simply as it was a means of securing amity and fair commerce with all nations. But the time has come when European nations apply to the nations on the continents of North and South America—if not to all on the globe—their ideas concerning the universal balance of power, and concerning the special balance of power, also, between the nations on other continents, when their ambition, their interests and their lust of power, involve all nations, especially those nations of the Western continents, in the results of European diplomacy, and the fate of European combinations; when it is no longer a question with any American nation, of amity and commerce, but a question of independence and security, that obliges them all to make themselves be felt as vital elements in the great family of nations. What is thus forced on all American nations, is supremely obligatory on the United States, as the leading nation among them. To us, it is an immense change—one which those who have made our national life, perhaps, depend upon our accepting it boldly, will some day discover to be pregnant with influences upon the fate of nations, of which they now have no conception. But these results are in the womb of time. What immediately imports us, is to understand, as well as we can, that condition and probable course of European affairs which may deter any European nation, or combination, from risking a war of conquest upon the United States; or may, in the

progress of such a war, give us advantages not clearly to be foreseen; or may, on the contrary, encourage our enemies to attack us, or strengthen them during the war. The subject is unspeakably vast and complex, and is not familiar to more than a very small number of American statesmen, diplomats, scholars, or thinkers. We shall treat it with great brevity, and in the most general manner.

With regard to England and France, there are some circumstances which put a very great difference between the two, with respect to their immediate and prospective policy toward the United States. In the first place, the British Queen is probably more the enemy of war with us, than the average of her subjects; while war with us, on the part of the French, will, if it occurs, be the exclusive result of the personal policy of the Emperor. Moreover, in the event of the demise of both of those crowns, the probable effects would be different; in France, such an event being, probably, decisive against war with America, while in England we deem it not at all apparent what effect such an event, or even a change of the ministry, would produce on that question. Still further, the complications of the Emperor of the French with everybody's affairs, and with every dangerous question in the world, far exceeds the corresponding complications of the British Government, so that he may incur embarrassments from that quarter, by serious war with us, far greater than the Queen of England would incur; while, on the other hand, the greater number and importance of the foreign colonies of Great Britain, and the immensely greater extent and value of her commerce, would make protracted war with the United States many times more perilous to her than to France. In addition, in the actual state of the world, and in the actual state of feeling between the French and English governments and people, it is not probable that either side would give to the other the great advantage which a separate war with America, by either of them, would give to the other. And finally, both of those governments must understand better than any one else can, that either of them is able, at any time, to precipitate affairs in various parts of the world, which would render their continued alliance in the highest degree precarious; that many events are liable to occur, any day, without

special procurement by either of them, which would produce the same effect upon their alliance; and that the effect of any such event, happening in either of the ways just suggested, would be of the most embarrassing nature, if it took place during actual united war, on their part, with the United States. If this is a just statement, nothing but English and French conduct and declarations could lead us to suppose that there was any serious intention, on the part of either nation, to bring on war with America; and nothing but the most important considerations on their part, could justify the risk of doing so. It is exactly that conduct and those declarations, which have obliged us to modify the opinions formerly expressed by us, and to which we have called attention, in a foot note, on a previous page. The modification we have been obliged to make, is very serious, and amounts to this, that both those nations are inclined, if not resolved, to press matters against us to the utmost limit their perversions of the law of nations will endure; and to risk war with us, in doing so, unless they become thoroughly convinced that the war they will bring on, will be far more serious than they now believe. It may be very difficult, independently of English and French conduct and declarations, to deduce from the state of the case we have delineated above, a probable conclusion on which we might rely, as to what either of those nations would feel safe in doing, with respect to us. In short, the case is like all others that end in hostilities between nations; a mixture of conflicting probabilities, each of which derives its importance from some other circumstances. And it is to be met, like all other cases of that sort, by the most careful endeavor to know everything, to provide for the worst, and to encounter whatever may happen with that wisdom and courage which make life the most triumphant, when it is the most distinctly valued lower than duty.

It is, probably, the universal opinion of English statesmen, that the supremacy of that nation at sea is the first condition of its security and greatness. To maintain that supremacy, no English sovereign, parliament, or party, has ever hesitated to perform any act of perfidy, or outrage, either in peace or in war, either upon enemy, ally, or dependent; and its maintenance is more clearly indispensable to the

greatness of England now, than at any former time, while the habitual immorality of the nation, on that subject, is virulent beyond all former precedent. The war of American independence, and the war of 1812-15, between the United States and Great Britain, wounded deeply the military pride of England; and the latter shocked, for the first time, her conviction of her invincibility at sea. In every part of England, the traveler sees monuments and hears names, that commemorate her great achievements in arms; and the popular enthusiasm never wearies in displaying them. But it is wonderful to behold the astonishment, almost the stupor, of an Englishman, when the American traveler demands of him, "Where are the palaces, the columns, the squares, the streets, the bridges, the arches, that commemorate the triumphs of your two American wars?" There is no such monument throughout the British Isles; there was never even a pretext for erecting one. The world speaks habitually of the desire of France to avenge Waterloo. If such feelings belong to nations, how much has Britain to avenge on America! And that such feelings are deeply cherished, they will the most readily admit who recall the burst of frantic rage all over England and Scotland, concerning the Mason and Slidell affair; who trace the whole course of British conduct during our present civil war; who examine the present state of British feeling, and the present tenor of British policy toward the United States; and who study the grounds, general and particular, of the policy of that powerful nation toward all others, that can possibly rival them in manufactures, in commerce, in wealth, in power—but above all, in maritime war. In all these immense interests, in which England has never tolerated a rival she was able to crush, or dared to attack, the destiny of the United States could not be accomplished, without her presenting herself continually before the whole world, in an attitude which England chooses to consider an attitude of insolent rivalry. The only idea that England has of the use of other nations, is that they should be safe and profitable customers to her. There are many grounds on which such a people might easily persuade themselves that the various conditions of such a policy would, in the aggregate, be far better fulfilled by the exhaustion and separation of the United

States, than by their continued union and growth; and there can be no doubt that, supposing the former fate to be the one desired for us by England, her conduct is well explained by such a desire. It is, no doubt, better for her, that we should be persuaded by her tender regard for peace and for us, to submit to our destiny, as expounded by her, than put her to the trouble, expense, and risk of forcing us to do so. As yet, therefore, diplomacy has not fully performed its office, and England will, probably, await the issue of the American campaign of 1863—and, possibly, of another, if that is not very decisive, before she does more than strengthen her present position. What American diplomacy may be able to accomplish, in the meantime, will depend upon the skill, the knowledge and the courage of the Government at Washington—the capacity of its diplomatic agents in foreign countries—and, not less than either, on the valor of our forces on land and water, and the competence of their commanders.

The foreign policy of France has always been an enigma to all but French diplomatists; and of all who directed it, or compounded it, from Philip the Second, of Spain, who, during his long reign, had many of the most conspicuous men in France constantly in his pay—not one has been less understood by his own generation, or apparently more absolutely a waiter on events, than the present Emperor. As far as he is understood, he appears to have accepted from the past—as far back at least as the Revolution of 1789—most of the settled ideas of his external policy, modified in some important respects by the actual state of the world on his coming to the throne. He accepted from the great men of that revolution the idea of making France a great maritime nation; and has pursued with great vigor the construction of ships, docks, and harbors, with special reference to the military marine of the empire. A great naval power is necessarily a great commercial one, or a great manufacturing one, or both. France was neither of the two—the idea of making her powerful at sea, originating in purely military views. So that the creation of manufactures, which had been destroyed by the persecutions of the Huguenots by Louis XIV, and the creation of commerce, which had been destroyed by the long wars originating out of the Revolution, and by the British supremacy at sea

during those wars, became the special concern of the government, side by side with the creation of the navy. Many considerations of position, population, climate, and production, fitted France to become a great naval, manufacturing, and commercial nation; and since the general pacification of Europe, by the treaty of Vienna, fifty years ago, her progress, in all these respects, has been prodigious. In the mean time, the wars that destroyed the commerce of France deprived her of her colonies. The present Emperor, by his recent treaty with England, made by him in the interest of French commerce and manufacture—made such concessions to England, in return for her coal and iron, that the industrial interests of both nations were added to the many other inducements to the good understanding between them, which is so dangerous to us, in our present circumstances. As a part of the same general maritime policy, the French Government, after the fall of the First Napoleon, accepted the policy of establishing foreign colonies, and began with conquering Algeria, in Africa. We believe there is no quarter of the globe in which Louis Napoleon has not occupied himself in adventures, sometimes openly, always manifestly, in search of new possessions. An Englishman could not be more grasping than he is. He has secured Savoy and Nice, and all Europe understands him to be seeking for Sicily, Sardinia, or anything he can get in Italy, and waiting on whatever event may enable him to seize the Rhinish Provinces of Prussia; while all the world knows what he did on the west coast of Africa, and in various and widely-scattered islands of the Pacific Ocean, and what he is now doing in Cochin China, on one side of the globe, and in Mexico on the other. England and the United States have both gold and cotton in their possessions. There is a wild story told by an American—which we will not repeat here in detail—that the French Emperor has inexhaustible gold fields in Central Africa, from which he secretly draws fabulous wealth—which mines, says the American, he purchased the knowledge of from him, and then threw him into prison, and robbed him of his papers and his pay, to secure the secret he had bought. But passing this by—the Emperor has neither gold mine nor cotton growing country of his own, and seems resolved to have both. This, no doubt, explains in

part, his present business in Mexico; and explains, also, the French intrigue in Texas at the period of its annexation to the United States, and the late renewal of that intrigue. Touching the rebellion in America, the moral support lent to it by Louis Napoleon, has been, we suppose, more decided than that lent to it by the English Government, and his intervention more direct. It is beyond our ability to say what he may do next. Possibly he may have determined on war against the United States, for refusing to accept his intervention. Possibly he may not declare war at all; may even refuse to co-operate with England any further touching American affairs. We do not see that it is possible for us to allow him to carry out the plans attributed to him in Mexico. He, however, denies that he has any such plans as are attributed to him. We have no interest in weakening France relatively to England; and it seems to us very clear that France, unless she is positively sure of her naval superiority over England, has no interest in weakening us. It seems to us impossible for England to allow him to establish a French Protectorate over Mexico, and by consequence over the Spanish States down to and beyond the Isthmus of Panama, and so over the transit between the two great oceans. And yet it may be that this is the very price paid him by England, for his effectual co-operation in the destruction of the United States! There again is diplomacy. What can be done on this French side, to ward off the effects of a combination, so threatening to the United States? What can be done with other European States, or interests, to anticipate and prevent the shock of a combined attack from France and England, or to enable us to resist it, and redress it, when it falls? So far, at least, we may answer: let us look the future steadily in the face, and be ready for all that can be attempted against us.

The fundamental necessity of the security of the United States, so far as that depends on diplomacy, is that our relations with one or other of the great powers of Western Europe (England or France) should be closer than their relations with each other; or, this being unattainable, that our relations with one or more of the great powers of Eastern Europe (Russia, for example, or the great German powers)

should be closer than the relations of those powers with England and France. By the former condition of things we would diminish, to the lowest degree, the probability of a joint attack from England and France; by the latter condition, we would increase, to the highest degree, the probability of the failure of such an attack, if it should be made; and by the union of both conditions, we should secure, in the highest degree attainable by diplomacy, peace with all European nations, by means of close friendship with some of the most powerful of them in peace, and alliance in war. We may observe that this state of things involves a great departure from our constant foreign policy, under the Federal Constitution, and is a recurrence to that of the Revolutionary Congress. It is a change based upon the new determination of the two greatest nations in the world, to subject the nations of these western continents to what free peoples must consider the system of menace, domination, oppression, and insult, which they habitually practice toward all weak nations, when they can do so with impunity. We may observe, also, that the utmost advantage we can ever obtain by diplomacy, can never be relied on as the principal, much less the sole security of our independence and liberty. And in like manner, it by no means follows that we must necessarily be sacrificed to the rage and perfidy even of the greatest foreign combinations, or to a disgraceful existence by their tolerance, even after diplomacy shall utterly fail. The life and the glory of powerful nations is in their own keeping; and the providence of God seldom forsakes those who are true to themselves.

Little more need be added to this outline, in order to present somewhat more precisely that general aspect of European affairs, out of which, as we have said, either France or England might produce, or out of which might arise without their procurement, such dangerous complications as would deter those great powers from risking war with the United States, or as might even break up the existing co-operation between them, while they were actually at war with us. If we look first at the Scandinavian States, in the north of Europe, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, we observe a decided movement toward the consolidation of them all into one great power—

which would elevate the three from their present insignificance, and constitute a great kingdom. On the one side, Russia has claims and objects, incompatible with such a result. On another side the Germanic Confederation raises objections connected with the Germanised Duchies that belong to Denmark. On the third side, England finds in such a result, security against the aggressions of Russia, security for free navigation of the Sound, and for free commerce in the Baltic, and security also against the increasing naval power of Russia. Moreover, the Prince of Wales has just married the daughter of the future king of Denmark,—the future king, most probably, of the united Scandinavian empire. But, in the meantime, the King of Sweden, the grandson of Bernadotte, has been at Paris, and “diplomatic circles,” as they are called, understand that the French Emperor will place him on the Scandinavian throne, in return for effective aid in carrying the French boundary to the Rhine. So, we enter by the German provinces of Denmark, by the dissatisfaction of the Germanic Confederation, and by the just alarm of Holland, Belgium, and especially Prussia, into the seething troubles of Central Europe. The German race has been, for two thousand years, one of the most numerous and powerful in Europe; and has kept itself weakened by its singularly absurd divisions, ever since the reign of Charlemagne. When the house of Hapsburg, under the dictation of the first Napoleon, laid aside the imperial title which had come down to them from the first Roman Emperor, and the reigning sovereign sunk down from Emperor of Germany into Emperor of Austria; the possibility of a final German unity existed no longer—except by means of vast popular revolutions, commensurate with this immense race. Subsequently to that remarkable event, at least three of these have occurred—each time changing the face of Europe. A State of the first rank in Central Europe has been accepted by European statesmen as a European necessity, ever since the treaty of Westphalia made the idea of the “balance of power,” the basis of the public law of Europe; and the constant effort has been to make Austria fulfill the conditions of a necessity which could only be fulfilled by the unity of the German race. We must leave to the reader to follow out this chain of facts and ideas.

Besides their own direct teaching, they connect themselves through the great non-German provinces of Austria, with Poland and Russia on one side ; with Hungary, the Danubian Provinces, Turkey, and Greece on another side ; and with Venetia and the great Italian question, on the third side. Southern Europe—especially Greece and Italy—seems to rest on a volcano. From the Baltic to the Mediterranean, those States and peoples are exceptions, in which great and perilous changes may not be considered as impending ; or, in which such changes impending hardly would not, by their sudden occurrence, produce convulsions. No convulsion anywhere along this great range of States and people, which would seriously threaten great changes, or protracted confusion, could fail to modify, in the most decided manner, any hostile demonstrations against the United States by England, and more especially by France. Indeed those two nations well understand that such convulsions, in various places, would be precipitated by their own complete occupation elsewhere. For example—in Italy—the moment the French Emperor should be unable to repress them ; in Syria, as soon as England should be disabled and France could coöperate with Russia ; in Egypt, as soon as France was disabled, and England could seal that gate to India—Spain is virtually a dependency on France and England.

It must be apparent, we think, to all well-informed persons, that any just view of the actual state of Europe, is calculated to encourage, rather than to alarm, the people of the United States, in view of the menacing attitude of England and France toward this country. We expect nothing from the justice or good faith of either of those nations. We expect nothing of the highest importance, from any events which may be called casual, or fortuitous, as to ourselves. We expect little from diplomacy, we regret to say ; and all the less, for special reasons which we forbear to express. Our great reliance is on the valor of our people—and the blessing of God. But it is a just encouragement to the nation, and a ground of praise to God, that innumerable circumstances in the present state of human affairs, do not leave those who are bent on our destruction, to pursue their course freely according to their desires. And if our enemies persist in their abominable

wickedness, many of those circumstances, over which we have little or no control, seem likely enough to work their more complete deliverance into our hands, and the more complete deliverance of nations, by our means, from a domination utterly selfish, relentless, and hypocritical. The partition of Poland, for which Russia, Austria, and Prussia have been held up to the execration of mankind by successive generations of English and French statesmen, is not worthy to be mentioned, whether as an act of utter perfidy, or as an irreparable injury to the cause of human civilization and progress, in comparison with the partition of the United States, which the Governments of the English and French people seem to have been carefully meditating for the last two years, and which, according to all appearances, they will consummate if they can. What a sublime display of God's mercy to our suffering race it would be if he should leave those two nations to fill up, in this attempt, the cup of their iniquity and make that attempt the means of limiting and repressing the enormous power they have so enormously abused!

It is a question by no means free from doubt, whether it would not have been a wiser and safer course for the American Government to have treated the recognition of the Rebel States as belligerents, by the European nations that first did it, as unfriendly acts looking directly to hostilities; and thus simplified our foreign relations, strengthened our national position, and placed the rebel war, as a question with other notions, on a different and far more manageable foundation. It is not less difficult to rest satisfied that the law of nations was rightly interpreted, or the honor of the nation duly consulted, or solid peace promoted, by delivering up Mason and Slidell, under menace, as an obvious afterthought, and after allowing the public sentiment of America to express its approval of their capture, in a manner not to be thought of without shame. The next step is the recognition of the independence of the Confederate States by foreign nations—which they profess to consider a peaceful, and not a hostile act—the natural consequence, as they say, of their recognition as belligerents and their proving, as they add, by two years of successful war, their ability to maintain their independence. We have

no means of forming a decided opinion as to the particular course that will be taken by the American Government, upon the happening of this event. The course which the national honor, as well as the national interest and duty demand, seems to us to be, that such an act should be treated as eminently hostile, short only of actual war; and that it should be met, on our part, by every means of injury to our foreign enemies, and of adding increased strength to our own position, short of a declaration of war. It is our opinion, moreover, that such an act on the part of any foreign nation—let it be disguised as it may, by that nation, or treated as it may by the American Government, or by traitorous factions among our people, must inevitably bring on war with that nation, or must accomplish the humiliation and partition of the United States. The final act is a declaration of war against the United States, and the armed support of the rebels; which may, indeed, accompany the acknowledgment of their independence, or may follow it in an alliance, offensive and defensive, succeeding a treaty of amity and commerce. The latter will probably be the course taken, especially on the part of England; inasmuch as it accords more naturally with the mixture of perfidiousness and violence, caution and outrage, which has distinguished every part of her conduct to the United States. Stripped of all pretexts and all contingencies—war on the part of England, and possibly of France, against America, is the direct conclusion of their principles, their policy, their conduct, their avowals, their view of their own interests, and their atrocious crowning object—the partition of the United States. Notwithstanding their ceaseless and countless falsehoods—they see that the rebels will be subdued; and they will make war for them, if they dare. Notwithstanding the immense and continual succor they have given disguisedly and perfidiously to these rebels, they see that their desires can not be accomplished in that way, and they will make war for them—if they dare. It is to be preferred that the declaration of war should be made by the foreign oppressor, rather than by us; and while the choice of war or peace is wholly with the foreigner, the choice of the way of making it, and the manner of bringing it on, is so far awkward to him, that a good deal of latitude, in those respects, will

probably be possessed by the American Government. What remains is to show that, if America is true to herself, and to the great part God has assigned to her, she may defy the foreigner, and defeat all his vile purposes toward her; or if she should prefer it, or the course of events should make it necessary, she may make just and terrible retribution upon the foreigner, for whatever she may suffer at his hands.

It will simplify what we have to say, and make more obvious the alternative that may arise in the progress of affairs, to treat the impending war under two distinct aspects. In the *first* place, as a purely *defensive war* on our part; that is, a war in which, so far as our country is concerned, we seek only what we have always avowed, namely, the preservation of the national life, and of all our national institutions in their complete integrity; and so far as the foreign aggressor is concerned, we seek only to conquer his armies and fleets, to drive him from our soil and coasts, and to damage and distress him everywhere, and in all his interests, in every way consistent with civilized war. But, at the same time, a war whose object is accomplished when the American Union and Constitution are fully reinstated—and the foreigner no longer molests us; never—until then. In the *second* place, as a *war of retribution* on our part. That is, a war in which, despairing of our rebellious countrymen, who call in the foreigner against their country, their race, their independence, and their freedom—we repudiate them as fellow-citizens, as they have repudiated us; but preferring them to the foreigner, we will seize from the foreigner territorial compensation for all we give up; clear the whole North American Continent of his presence and his claims (except those of Russia); drive him from the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea; and by a new combination of North American Nations, a new distribution of territory, and permanent offensive and defensive alliances—make North American independence and security forever complete; and, consolidating the whole power of the continent, hurl it against the corrupt and audacious combination that knows neither piety, nor justice, nor faith. In proceeding to explain, very briefly, our ideas on both these aspects of the war—both these alternatives set before us by it—we will speak as if that war were a joint one of England and France

against the United States. We do so, partly, to avoid repetition; but mainly because, in this manner, the most dangerous aspect of the situation is presented; and because, only in that event, does any necessity arise for considering the alternative of *retributive war* on our part? Whoever will consider the matter calmly will, we think, readily agree that any additional force which either England or France, separately, could bring to the rebels, would not seriously increase the danger of the United States, or render it necessary to resort to any extraordinary means of safety or redress. In that case, it would never be a question of compounding with the Confederate States, and forming alliances with the Spanish States of North America, on the basis of clearing America and its seas of the foreigner; as the alternative of the complete humiliation of the continent, and the forcible partition of the United States; but would remain simply a question of increased vigor in the prosecution of the war. It is by no means certain that the alternative of *retributive war* will actually arise—even if we are attacked by England and France unitedly. We propose to show that we can maintain our independence against both. But it is an alternative which it may please God that we should take. It is one full of vast recompense to us, and of vast danger and disgrace to England and France. It is one pregnant with blessings to mankind, inferior only to those which these superceded. It is one, therefore, which we should face manfully; and whose distinct statement may be our truest diplomacy, with regard both to England and France.

Considering the impending war as merely *defensive*, in the sense already explained, the suggestion of some leading conditions of it will explain, as fully as our limits permit, our conception of its course and result. And, first of all, it is manifest that the partition of the United States can not be accomplished by any hostile force whatever, without first conquering the loyal States; and that this can not be done except by a *land* force greatly more powerful than the land force of those States; that is, by a land force greatly more powerful than a million of American soldiers in the field, with at least three millions more in reserve, to take their places when they fall. The addition of a hundred thousand French veteran

troops, and of a hundred thousand English veteran troops, to whatever force the rebels might be able to keep in the field, would not, in fact, equalize the contest, much less give to the combined army the remotest chance of conquering the loyal States. We suppose that neither France nor England can ever land on our shores, and keep in active service, such a force as we have stated. The distance, the expense, and the uncertainty of the transportation by sea of such bodies of troops, with the necessary arms, warlike munitions, military stores, and means of support—in the face, too, of all the possibilities of naval warfare—seems to us to render the mere transportation to the theater of war nearly as difficult, as it would be useless, if it could be successfully accomplished. Moreover, the total destruction of whatever England and France might embark in such an enterprise, would not be the heaviest portion of the blow to their power which would attend its loss; the very sailing of such an expedition from the ports of Europe would shake the European predominance of these powers, and the first serious reverse to it would change the face of things upon that whole continent. Bear in mind, also, that military operations with a view to the conquest of our loyal States, must be carried on over an area several times as large as all Europe—an area occupied by little short of twenty-five millions of warlike people; intersected by impassable rivers and mountains; defended by forests not less secure than that famous Hyrcana from which the Roman legions recoiled; skirted by plains greater and more defensible than the deserts which have protected Arabian independence through all time; and occupied by cities rivaling the oldest and finest capitals of the world. But for the just indignation roused by such attempts upon the freedom of nations, and the deep abhorrence with which every virtuous mind must regard the scandalous pretexts upon which they are excused, the idea of two or three hundred thousand Frenchmen and Englishmen seriously setting forth to conquer and partition the United States, would be irresistibly ludicrous. We solemnly aver that if the rebels would agree to stand neuter and abide the result, we would be glad, and consider our cause much amended, to allow half a million of the best English and French troops that exist to land where they please in America,

and let the result depend on our killing, capturing, or driving into the sea the last man of them!

The *naval* aspect of the war may be supposed to be more discouraging to America. We can hardly agree that it is so. It is probable that the maritime power of France and England combined is greater than that of all other nations; and they would, no doubt, rely chiefly upon it, and use it very extensively. We have already seen that no imaginable use of a hostile maritime force can ever result in the conquest or the partition of the United States. The breadth of the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, varies from three to four thousand miles. One had as well think of taking the moon with ships, as such a country. On the contrary, our iron ships can be as conveniently built on navigable streams two thousand miles from the sea, as in our seaports. Naval warfare has undergone several complete revolutions within the living generation. The application of steam to deep sea navigation, about twenty-five years ago, and immediately afterward to ships of war, may be counted the first. Then, after an interval of many years, the free application of iron for the protection of ships of war; and more recently its exclusive use in the construction of vessels supposed to be nearly invulnerable. Upon this, human ingenuity was directed anew to the questions of cannon, projectiles, and the proper manufacture and use of powder, seeking some security against these invulnerable structures of iron; and it seems to have gone far in proving that no mere *coating* of iron which will not sink a ship, is sufficient to protect it against the newly-invented instruments of destruction. And, finally, the construction and use of the prows of ships, after the general idea of the most ancient maritime nations, so as with them to crush the enemy's vessels by actual impact, under irresistible momentum, at the same moment that the most destructive modern projectiles are fired into them, and boiling water is thrown in diabolical torrents upon them, seems to have brought the whole matter of naval warfare into a position which requires a great naval war to resolve completely its terrible problems. Perhaps England and France, as the great naval powers of the world, could not do better than to get the benefit of the skill and hardihood of American seamen, in practically resolv-

ing problems so vitally important to them. In the meantime, certain facts of very great significance appear to have been clearly established, and others rendered violently probable. As between iron-clad vessels and wooden vessels, the latter seem to be, under ordinary circumstances, helpless. In contact with *iron* vessels, wooden ones seem to furnish hardly an appreciable resistance, and iron-clad ones none that is serious. Iron vessels have not, we believe, come in conflict; in the case of the Monitor and the Merrimac, the better opinion is that the former escaped any injury, and the latter was nearly fatally damaged; but we do not understand that the latter was *absolutely an iron* vessel, while we do understand that her dimensions, armament, and crew were manifold the greater of the two. The ram fixture on steamships has proved itself utterly destructive against wooden vessels, and very seriously so against iron-clad vessels; but when used against the iron Monitor by the Merrimac, the injury was to the ship using it. If one could bring himself to think with composure of the boiling-water proceeding, it would probably commend itself as singularly efficacious against all rash attempts at carrying an iron vessel by boarding.

The sum of these results, as it bears upon American affairs, is of decisive importance. As a country rich in iron and coal, it has every advantage that any other nation has in the rapid construction of an iron navy, and incalculably the advantage of France, which is almost destitute of both. Possessing at the present moment more iron vessels of war in commission, and more in the process of construction, than England and France united, she is, for many of the exigencies of the impending war, on a footing of equality with her great maritime enemies. The course of improvement and discovery has suddenly rendered nugatory the overwhelming naval power hitherto possessed by those combined enemies. At this great crisis of her destiny she starts fairly with them, not only in the work of preparation for her present defense, but for that future maritime equality with the greatest nations, which her safety demands, and for which everything qualifies her in so preëminent a manner. The successive revolutions in naval affairs, which we have briefly alluded to, have produced effects as remarkable on coast, harbor, and river defenses against

vessels, as those we have pointed out with regard to vessels and fleets when engaged with each other. For iron vessels are apparently obliged to be constructed in such a manner that they are incapable of delivering their fire except in a nearly horizontal manner. Even field works of dirt slightly elevated are impregnable to them, as was abundantly proved, not long ago, by a fruitless and protracted attack of several of our best iron ships upon Fort McAlister, which seems to be a low mud work. Unite the two facts, that no ship but an iron ship can resist an iron ship, and that no iron ship can be successfully used against proper land defenses, and we have the elements of complete security for all land defenses against attacks from sea. One or two iron ships, with ram prows, might readily destroy the whole British wooden and iron-clad navy, if gathered in the waters about any of our principal seaports; while without such ships as can throw shot and shell at a higher angle than iron ships can throw them, no properly constructed land defenses can be taken from the water side. The truth is, the operations of the great British fleet in the Baltic under Admiral Napier, and those of the combined English and French fleets against Sebastopol, which are the latest foreign operations on a large scale, do not inspire much alarm, even where no iron ship coöperates with land defenses. And certainly the aggregate experience of our attempts during the present war, to take land defenses by attacks from the water side, even where no iron ship assisted the land defenses, are not calculated to terrify us with the anticipated attempts of any possible combination of French and British ships. We must remember, also, that the population in the immediate vicinage of nearly all our great seaports and cities which are open to attack from the water, is collected in such great masses, or is so situated strategetically with regard to the general population, that no land force which could accompany an attacking fleet would be of the least use. The city of New York and its natural *banlieue* contain two hundred thousand persons accustomed to the use of arms, and capable of offering fatal resistance to a hostile force attempting to land in its noble harbor; and the various lines of access into the city could deliver them an equal number of such persons in a single week, or less. This is the case of our principal commercial city

and chief seaport, but it illustrates what is true, in different degrees, of all those of high importance which could be attacked in ships. So far as our seaport, harbor, and river defense is concerned, we have less ground for serious apprehension, than any one who does not carefully examine the subject would easily believe.

As a question of mere war—mere danger to America—mere help to the rebels, we are not able to perceive any special ground of confidence that England and France need rely on, nor any prospect affording reasonable hopes of advantage to the rebels, nor any circumstance suggesting unworthy apprehensions to the loyal people of the United States. It would be a war infinitely atrocious on the part of Great Britain and France, to the last degree disgraceful to our rebel countrymen, and accompanied, no doubt, with innumerable evils to all parties engaged in it, and to millions of human beings besides. Its unforeseen effects might be incalculable; those which might be foreseen as eminently probable, but which we can not now discuss, and will not even suggest, must be unspeakably important. We who have nothing to do but accept war, if it is forced upon us, as one of those unavoidable necessities which nations encounter, are the only party to it in a condition to reap important advantages from it during its progress, and to derive great benefits from its conclusion. It is hardly possible for any serious change in the state of Europe to occur during the war, which can turn to our injury, and which may not be turned to our advantage. It is extremely probable that one effect of the war will be to unite the population of all the loyal States, in a more cordial and unanimous support of our national life; and it is far from impossible, that immense portions of the Southern people will refuse to follow the flag of the foreigner against that of their country, in a war by which triumph can only deliver them forever to the domination of a domestic aristocracy supported by a foreign one more detestable than themselves—while defeat will rob them of their last plea for the sympathy of nations, or the forbearing construction of posterity. The history of public crime affords nothing more infamous in nations, or more detestable to mankind, than the calling-in of foreign tyrants against our country; nor is any lesson of the past

more uniform or more instructive, than the constant ruin and degradation of all who partake of such unnatural wickedness. We are slow to believe that the bulk of the Southern people will willingly submit to such a fate; and it will cause us no surprise, if war with the foreigner, in this quarrel, should prove to be a decisive step toward the triumph of the nation over all factions. A further necessary advantage of the war to us will be clearly understood, by recalling the damage and alarm created by two or three armed vessels under the Confederate flag, which have roamed, apparently at will, over the Atlantic Ocean, for many months past. When hundreds of such vessels, sent to sea by the Government, by individuals, and by companies—sent to sea singly and in fleets—fall upon the commerce and the colonies of our enemies, wherever their flags float or their interests exist, they will discover the difference between some temporary suffering and inconvenience of a few persons from a short supply of American cotton, and the want of bread to eat by millions of starving poor, accompanied by the blaze of captured ships burning on every line of commerce, and at the very entrance of every hostile port, and attended by that utter destruction of every assailable source of power and wealth, which the just rage of a heroic people, put on the defense of their very existence, will know how to execute. And our own people will discover that *open war* may not be more dangerous, and may be more profitable, than the *disguised war* which our foreign enemies have long diligently prosecuted, under every false pretext. The immeasurable difference in safety and advantage to America, as well as in loss and injury to her enemies, between merely guarding a portion of our coast against smuggling, and launching our whole naval power over every sea upon the globe, to work the utmost possible damage upon the two richest of all maritime, commercial and manufacturing nations. And, to mention nothing more, the conclusion of the war, even when considered merely as *defensive*, may well produce vast changes as in the relations of the colonial possessions of the British crown, especially of those on this continent; and equally vast changes upon the power and the pretensions of the Emperor of the French. But satisfaction for the past and security for the future, which none have more habitually or more rigor-

ously enforced, where they had the power, than England and France; appertain rather to the idea of that *retributive war*, to which we have alluded as a possible means of deliverance to America; and which we will now speak of briefly.

It is possible that many who unite with us in the intense conviction that the humiliation and partition of the United States by France and England, is a fate too horrible to be endured under any possible circumstances, may not share our confidence in the ability of the American people to defy and to defeat the whole power which both of those nations can add to the power of our own Rebel States, in the prosecution of the damning attempt. It is possible, also, as we must with all humility confess, that we may be much in error in the grounds of that unshaken confidence, which many others may repudiate; much in error, as many may think, in interpreting as we have done the real feelings and intentions of England and France toward the United States, and the true grounds upon which alone they will hesitate to proceed to extremities; and much in error, again, in our judgment concerning the natural and fatal self-delusion of that great hostile combination, on the question of their ability to crush us, without serious danger to themselves. It is, therefore, on these very accounts, important—as it is of itself supremely important—that the mind of the nation should be directed to every sober aspect of a subject so momentous. The northern portion of the nation rang with assurances that the Secessionists would never appeal to arms, until the fall of Fort Sumter broke the fatal spell. The vast trading and commercial interests of the nation may just as naturally and fatally delude themselves and others with hopes of fair dealing on the part of England and France, and consequent peace with them, until a succession of stunning blows awakens the nation to find itself on the brink of ruin. If, therefore, they who may suppose there is much error in what we have advanced, can be startled into the assurance that there is also much truth, and demand of us any alternative for the nation, better than submission at the dictation of France and England to our humiliation and partition, our answer has been given in the preceding pages. *Anything is better.* What is best of all, is manful war, with good hope of victory over all enemies united. If this be pronounced by the nation too

frightful in the sufferings it will entail, and the failure which it suggests, and inadequate, besides, in the lack of distinct and suitable redress for wrongs and injuries, in the attempt supposed, beyond parallel; and the demand be pressed for some other alternative, at once sure, retributive, and triumphant, we answer, yes, there is another, and, though not satisfying to us like the one we have discussed, a sublime alternative. Be sure of peace or of war with England and France. If war, take from the British crown her entire possessions on this continent, and her entire seaward possessions along vast coasts of the continent. Grant their independence to as many of the revolted States as desire to have it; making the condition of the grant, cordial and effectual participation on their part in exacting and enforcing the retribution in full; granting them, also, a due share of all retribution exacted from France and England, and guaranteeing their independence forever. Enter into alliance with Mexico and Central America, guarantee their independence and allow to them, as to the Confederate States, a fair proportion of new possessions in the Gulf and in the Caribbean Sea; driving the French out of Mexico, and securing the co-operation of that Republic and of Central America, in liberating the continent, and clearing it forever from the oppression of foreign nations. If the North American continent and States must enter, by the inevitable force of events, into the circle of European ideas and conflicts, let us enter, not separately and under the dictation of European combinations, but unitedly and invincibly—the equal in all things of the most powerful combination which the conflicting Kingdoms of Europe can present. Republican liberty is entitled to a dwelling-place on earth. The Emperors, the Kings, and the Potentates of Europe have driven out, by their atrocities, a population now numbering fifty millions on this continent; and they must not be allowed to renew their outrages on this side of the ocean. If the United States shall have no alternative but their own division—which may God forbid—the choice would still remain to her of entering upon her new career under utter humiliation and in profound darkness, or, of entering upon it arrayed in the spoils of those who came to spoil her; and leading a continent of free nations,

whose destiny her own heroic self-sacrifice had retrieved, and her genius and her valor assured!

We feel how hard it is to make or to tolerate any suggestion which looks toward anything but the integrity of that Union which seems to us so worthy of all love, and the perpetuity of those institutions whose like we shall never see again. We see how easy it is to cavil at much that we have written; how many things need to be more fully explained; how many that we have not even mentioned need to be profoundly considered. But, in proportion to their grandeur, all subjects, all ideas, brook the evils of ill-sorting, just as nations, by their very greatness, may endure misguidance, under which the feeble perish at once. Do men remember that it took the Roman Empire a thousand years to die? Can freemen forget that a few small and feeble provinces in Holland fought Spain for their liberty for nearly a century, during which Spain was the first power in Europe, and won their liberty and broke forever the power of Spain? We feel how bitter is the necessity, and how fierce is the difficulty, of subduing our rebellious countrymen, who bear no proportion to us in strength. What progress could they make in an attempt to subdue us? Let those who look with uneasiness on the proceedings of England and France, or hear their menaces with apprehension, take courage. It may be required of America, by Divine Providence, to liberate the world from the dominion of these powers. We may suffer much and long in executing that purpose of God. We may be obliged to make great changes, which we did not design, and which will be painful to us, great as may be our retribution. Still let us take comfort. To be the greatest of all nations if we triumph—to be the most renowned if we perish nobly; one or other destiny lies plainly before us. Who is not content to allow God to choose between them for us?

ART. IV.—*Chaplaincy in the Army.*

AN announcement has been repeatedly made through the public press that on the evening of the 22d of last February, one of the Major Generals of the army of the United States, known, too, as a devout Christian, declared in the Representatives' Hall in the city of Washington, that the chaplaincy system of the army has proved a failure. The reasons for this announcement, as we have seen them stated, are not, however, such as would justify the conclusion either that the system as such has failed, or that it should be dispensed with, and a different provision substituted in lieu thereof, as we shall take occasion to show hereafter. But the remark has been a thousand times repeated, not only by friends but also by the foes of religion, and has both received a construction and been made to favor an application which is as opposite as light is to darkness from the mind and intention of the distinguished officer who gave it utterance. He never designed to favor the impression that the ministrations of religion might be dispensed with as useless in the camp, or that our armies in the field and the troops occupying our military posts might be left without the regular and authorized institutions of the Gospel, so far, at least, as it is possible in the circumstances to have them regularly administered; but to convey the idea (so that a remedy might be provided), that in a great measure as heretofore conducted, and mainly since the commencement of the present war, the method by which such a result was sought, has failed to secure its great and desirable end. That the remark, greatly as it has been misconstrued, meant neither more nor less than this, we think can not be doubted. The whole subject is a deeply important one, and we propose to devote a few pages to its consideration.

In the *Revised Army Regulations*, published in 1861, the chaplaincy is referred to as follows :

“ One Chaplain shall be allowed to each regiment of the army, to be appointed by the Colonel on the nomination of the company commanders. None but regularly ordained ministers of some Christian denomination, however, shall be eligible to appointment, and the wishes and wants of the soldiers of the regiment shall be allowed their *full and due*

weight in making the selection. The proceedings in each case will be immediately forwarded to the Adjutant General's office, the name and denomination of the Chaplain being in every case reported. Chaplains will only be allowed to regiments which are embodied and serving together as one whole—not to regiments of which the companies are serving at different stations.

"Chaplains not to exceed thirty in number are also allowed to posts. The posts at which Chaplains may be employed will be announced by the War Department, but the *appointment* will be made by the Council of Administration.

"The Council of the post will, however, report to the Adjutant General, for the approval of the Secretary of War, the rate of pay allowed to the person selected to officiate as Chaplain, and perform the duties of schoolmaster; the decision of the Secretary on this point will be notified to the commanding officer of the post by the Adjutant General."—*Article 24.*

In the appended "*Extracts from the Acts of Congress*," section nine, the following occurs :

"*And be it further enacted*, That there shall be allowed to each regiment one Chaplain, who shall be appointed by the regimental commander on the vote of the field officers and company commanders on duty with the regiment at the time the appointment shall be made. The Chaplain, so appointed, must be a regular ordained minister of a Christian denomination, and shall receive the pay and allowances of a Captain of cavalry, and shall be required to report to the Colonel commanding the regiment to which he is attached, at the end of each quarter, the moral and religious condition of the regiment, and such suggestions as may conduce to the social happiness and moral improvement of the troops."

The *second* and *fourth* of the "*Articles of War*" refer likewise to the subject, and read as follows :

"It is earnestly recommended to all officers and soldiers diligently to attend divine service; and all officers who shall behave indecently or irreverently at any place of divine worship shall, if commissioned officers, be brought before a general court-martial, there to be publicly and severely reprimanded by the president; if non-commissioned officers or soldiers, every person so offending shall, for his first offense, forfeit one-sixth of a dollar, to be deducted out of his next pay; for the second offense, he shall not only forfeit a like sum, but be confined twenty-four hours; and for every like offense, shall suffer and pay in like manner;

which money, so forfeited, shall be applied, by the Captain or senior officer of the troop or company, to the use of the sick soldiers of the company or troop to which the offender belongs.

“Every Chaplain commissioned in the army or armies of the United States, who shall absent himself from the duties assigned him (excepting in cases of sickness or leave of absence), shall, on conviction thereof before a court-martial, be fined not exceeding one month's pay, besides the loss of his pay during his absence; or be discharged, as the court-martial shall judge proper.”

We cite these articles because we shall have occasion to refer to them in the sequel, and that our readers may be able to view them in connection with the whole subject. They have been framed with great and commendable care, and after a very full and wise consideration of the matter. And those who charge them with deficiency and incompleteness, would better evince the propriety of their claim to sit in judgment by first making themselves acquainted with the facts in the case, and then by propounding a code in which the alleged deficiencies are supplied. We are quite satisfied that had these regulations been strictly adhered to, and faithfully executed in their true spirit, and according to the design of those who framed and those who adopted them, the system of the chaplaincy would never have been in any proper sense of the terms regarded as a failure.

As to both the propriety and importance of having an earnest and godly minister of Jesus Christ appointed to each of our military posts, and to accompany every regiment which is called into the field, as it has been, on deliberate consideration, recognized by our Government, and as there certainly can be no question on the subject in a Christian community, so it is obvious that any one either in the State or army, who should, at the present time and in the existing state of things, pronounce the measure a failure, would assume a responsibility in view both of the Government and country, which would place him in no enviable position, if such announcement were found to be based on insufficient data, or on hasty and premature conclusions. Such a judgment is undoubtedly premature in the existing state of affairs, and based upon occurrences which have transpired since the war begun. In the somewhat hurried and extemporized condition of our national

affairs, civil and military, the system of the chaplaincy has not had and could not have had a trial sufficient to warrant any such pronouncement. When our enemies in Europe pronounce, as they have recently so often done, that republican institutions are a failure; and that the war to preserve the Union is a failure; and that the Union itself is a failure, basing the representation on the occurrences of the past two years, we have unhesitatingly replied to them that the wish is doubtless father to the thought; inasmuch as the new complications which have arisen, although they have severely tested republican principles and institutions, have not by any means decided the question as to their durability; and that our enemies are quite premature in their conclusion that the events of the last two years have proved either that our war to preserve the Union, or the Union itself, is a failure. And when our enemies, moreover, have sneered at the unmilitary appearance of our soldiery at the outset, and at the want of military knowledge, as well as the actual incapacity of many of the officers who had been appointed to command companies, regiments, and brigades; what has been the response? And still further, what would the response of the country have been, if from such facts some high officer, either civil or military, had announced that the attempt to equip, train, and officer the American forces had proved a failure, and that several brigades, a large number of regiments, and very many companies were almost destitute of competent officers? We should have told him, and told him very plainly, that in the sudden and great emergency in which we were called to act, we have done the best we could; that many who had received the appointment of Surgeon, Captain, Colonel, and even General had received little or no military training, and were unacquainted with the profession of arms; and that it was, therefore, entirely premature to conclude, on the grounds asserted, that our military system was a failure; that if he thus sought to remedy the evil, the declaration was unguarded and unnecessary, injurious to the cause of our country, and helpful only to the cause of our foes.

The parallel between this case and the one in illustration of which it has been cited is sufficiently obvious, and need not be further drawn out or dwelt upon. For the same thing that is

true of the other officers of the army is true also of its Chaplains. Among them, likewise, were those who were wholly unfitted for their station. None of them, moreover, had been accustomed to military life, or to labor in the camp; and some were appointed in direct contradiction to the aforesaid military statutes, not being clergymen in any Christian denomination, or even professors of religion. Others were incompetent on the score of education; and others, who loved their work as ministers of Christ, and were in all respects well able to perform it so far as knowledge, piety, and intellectual ability are concerned, found their health fail under the pressure of official responsibilities; willing and anxious to do all that they could do, yet their physical system yielded before the drafts made upon it by the severe labors and hardships of the camp and field; as is true also of many other equally able and patriotic officers of the army. These facts being known and indisputable, it may well be asked why, and for what reason, is the chaplaincy to be thus singled out and pronounced a failure? And why should data, insufficient for such a conclusion in every other case, be deemed sufficient in this? Can satisfactory reasons be assigned for such a procedure? We think not.

That the brave and gallant defenders of our country and constitution should, on entering the army, be deprived of the institutions of religion, is an idea utterly abhorrent to all the feelings of a Christian community, and would not be seriously tolerated for a moment in our country. The Chaplain may not be able in certain circumstances to perform all or even half that his heart is set upon to accomplish; but if a true servant of his Divine Master and devoted to his work, he will watch his opportunity, and by God's blessing, his field, however unpromising it may appear at first, will yield its fruit. The value of the mere presence of a godly minister in a regiment, even though the untoward circumstances hereinafter to be referred to, should at times deprive him of the opportunity of preaching, except to a few, is truly great. Those who profess faith in the Saviour will be greatly cheered and comforted by his presence. He is there to counsel them and all, and to intercede for his charge at the blood-bought mercy-seat; to counsel and direct and attend upon the sick and wounded, and to

bury their dead. And can any suppose these to be trifles, and matters of no serious importance to the brave men who, for the time being, have severed all the ties and upyielded all the comforts of social life for the hardships of the camp and field, and to imperil health and life itself in defense of their country? The fact that the chaplaincy, as connected with our present vast army, has failed to accomplish all that was hoped from it, is sad to contemplate. But the reasons of that failure are not to be traced, we apprehend, to the supposed inutility of the office itself; and if they can be accurately pointed out and laid before the public, as they were in the case of the incompetent officers before referred to, we question not for a moment that the Christian community will not be backward to devise means for a remedy. And this is our design in proposing the few thoughts which we have to offer on the subject.

Very inadequate ideas have been entertained (and often freely expressed) by the Christian public itself, in relation to the whole subject of chaplaincy in the army. And many even of those who have sustained that office, as before remarked, seemed not to be aware of its duties and responsibilities. And while the importance and actual necessity of the office, are, as we have shown, fully recognized by the Government, and freely conceded by the public; its nature, duties, and responsibilities have not unfrequently been discussed in the most vague and indefinite manner; and conclusions vitally affecting the whole subject, drawn from the most inaccurate and insufficient premises. And this is in fact the true state of the case at present. Hence the necessity is apparent for obtaining definite and accurate ideas on the subject. For until they are obtained by the public, its action in the matter (should it act at all, as we trust it will), may as easily be in a wrong as in the right direction. And while they undertake to give counsel who practically know absolutely nothing of the matter; and while their counsels are applauded and their suggestions attempted to be carried into effect, all idea must be abandoned of arriving at intelligent and practical results, together with all hope of providing a sufficient remedy for the alleged failure aforesaid, and for rendering this arm of the service as efficient as it should be.

But we shall take occasion to refer to this point again on a subsequent page.

The office of the Chaplain is not that of a pastor, strictly speaking, and in the ordinary sense of that term; though it does involve all the sacred obligations of that office in reference to the care of souls. But there neither is, nor can there be in the existing state of things, anything equivalent to a church organization, a bench of deacons and elders; an administration of the sacraments, and of ecclesiastical discipline; or any investing of the office with that authority which is most cheerfully conceded to the pastor in his own communion, and which he is expected to exercise. And never were the wholly inadequate views entertained on this subject by many of our Chaplains more strikingly exhibited than the effort which they made in the Army of the Potomac, at the commencement of the war to inaugurate in the regiments a sort of church organization. The effort evinced a commendable zeal, but a zeal without knowledge in the true sense of the terms; and as any one at all practically acquainted with the duties of the chaplaincy, could scarcely fail to see, must result in disastrous failure. We say *disastrous*; because as it was wholly out of the question for any such attempt to succeed, so the office of the chaplaincy by being brought thus into association with it, the failure of this unadvised movement, could not, by many, be otherwise construed than as a failure of the chaplaincy itself. But the failure of this, and of any and every similar movement, and the fact, moreover, that there have been and still are unfaithful and incompetent incumbents of the office, prove no more against the importance of the office itself, than the fact that there have been a failure of some of our military plans of operation; and that there have been and still are unfaithful and incompetent officers in the army, would prove the military department of our country to be a failure; or the fact that there are unfaithful and incompetent pastors and missionaries, would prove the pastoral office to be a failure; and that the whole missionary enterprise should be abandoned. The extreme shallowness and inconclusiveness of such attempts at ratiocination would be at once detected and exposed on any other subject than that to which they have thus been applied.

We might in like manner proceed to show, also, that as the Chaplain is not in strictness of terms a pastor, neither is his office that of a missionary, if we employ this term in its ordinary sense and application, but this is unnecessary. Our design in adverting at all to such a train of remarks, is simply to present, in brief, a view of the mistakes which have been made, and which must inevitably be made in every effort to obtain a stand-point from which to contemplate and decide upon the duties of the chaplaincy, by viewing those duties and obligations through the medium of some other organization or institution. In England, or in any country, where a denomination is nationalized, there is less difficulty in finding resemblances and drawing analogies; and in the light of them deducing conclusions and prescribing specific duties, plans of operation, and the like; but the attempt to do anything of the sort in respect to the armies of our country, can not but result in confusion and disappointment.

The proper position of the Chaplain in relation to the army is clearly and fully recognized in the aforesaid acts of Congress and articles of war. He is to be a recognized minister of Jesus Christ; and as such is to preach the Gospel, and to labor in the best way he can for the spiritual benefit of those who have been committed to his charge. He is supposed to understand the duties of his office as a minister of Christ, and to be able to decide for himself as to the best and wisest method of performing them. Hence there is no attempt at dictation; and the whole matter is wisely left entirely to him. We say wisely; for the gifts of the ministry, and consequently the modes adopted for performing their work in this sphere, are as diverse as they are found to be in the missionary field, or in that of the settled pastorate itself. He is appointed to the office as a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ. As such he receives from the Government his commission, and enters upon the field to do the work of his Divine Master. He can go in no other capacity, and in no other capacity can he be regarded as possessing authority. The work is assigned to him, and is before him, and he is to decide for himself as to the best method of performing it. And woe to him, if through negligence, or disinclination, or anything else under his control, he fail to perform that work! No one else can share his

responsibility, and no one, therefore, should presume to dictate to him in respect to the discharge of that responsibility—a thought which it would be well for some to remember, who, without any knowledge whatever of the subject, have been rather more forward than propriety would permit, in propounding their crude suggestions.

As to the asserted failure of this office during the past two years to accomplish what was expected from it, let the question, as already intimated, be adjudicated according to the same principles which are applied to the analogous cases to which we have also referred, and we ask nothing more. Candor itself must admit the justice and equity of this suggestion, and must also concede that the announcement of any such inference from such premises, was as illogical as it was premature. If the chaplaincy has not accomplished all that was expected of it during the last two years, how does this prove that the chaplaincy in the American army is a failure? We do not attribute the sentiment as thus expressed to General Howard, but are referring to the illegitimate use which has been made of what he did say. And in view of the matter, therefore, let it be remembered and considered, that the nation was taken entirely by surprise in regard to the existing war. A necessity suddenly arose for immediately collecting immense armies from the walks of private life. Many entered the service as private soldiers and as officers, who were not only unprepared for the discharge of the duties devolving upon them, but many who both in an intellectual or moral point of view were incapable of fulfilling them, and of course they failed in the effort. Such, too, was the character of many who entered as Chaplains, and of course they likewise failed in their department; and instead of expressing surprise at this, it would indeed have been surprising had they not failed.

We have not ourselves been personally conversant with such cases, and therefore can not speak of this matter from personal observation. But from representations brought before the public from sources whose veracity and candor can not be reasonably questioned, it must be admitted that not a few have entered upon the discharge of the duties of Chaplain not only with no adequate knowledge of its official

responsibilities, but who were intellectually and morally disqualified for their performance. We might specify instances, but this is hardly necessary. Some, too, as already stated, were appointed to the office who were not known as ministers of the Gospel, and who did not even profess to be such; and others who, though professing to be such, were not connected with any religious denomination. For, notwithstanding the aforesaid articles of war and acts of Congress are so very explicit on the subject, it must be recollected that at the outset those acts and articles were comparatively very little known even to the volunteers themselves, until after the regiments were already formed, and many of them in the field. It was indeed known that every regiment should have its Chaplain; but the directions in regard to his required status were not known. The Government, by a recent action, has very properly and with some success taken in hand the correction of such abuses, but let us not judge too harshly even those who were implicated therein. The difficulty in the way of supplying qualified incumbents of the office was very great. The churches themselves of the various denominations in our land, were and still are but inadequately supplied with a ministry, and it could hardly be expected that they should at once send off some eight hundred or a thousand well-qualified clergymen to occupy the office of Chaplain. At all events the abuse existed. And we may easily imagine what would be the effect upon religion and morality were the pulpits in our land to be supplied after such a fashion as the aforesaid. And is it, then, surprising that very little good and much evil has accrued to the cause of religion so far as such abuses in the army could operate? To look for any other results in the premises would be to expect grapes from thorns, and figs from thistles. And in view of this fact we only ask: Is it fair and just to attribute such a failure to the chaplaincy, when not only the true and recognized Chaplain had nothing to do with the matter, but when the failure itself occurred simply because he had nothing to do with it?

In the same connection it should likewise be remembered, as already remarked, that many excellent and able men have been obliged to resign the office on account of the failure of health in the discharge of its great responsibilities. But all

this can not surely be pleaded as sustaining the allegation that the chaplaincy is a failure; though we freely allow that so far as intellectual and moral incompetency and a failure of health are concerned, the results have not been what they otherwise would have been. There is, therefore, really no just ground on which to asseverate that the system itself is a failure.

This last topic suggests another which requires to be dwelt upon in the same connection. We advert to the difficulties which the Chaplain must encounter in the performance of the duties of his office in the volunteer army when in active service. Few who neither are nor have been associated with the army can know anything about them; and the subject needs to be brought out somewhat fully before the public, in order that it may be properly apprehended. These difficulties are multiform, and in many respects are such as are unprecedented to the Christian ministry in this land, and where immediate results are looked for, are extremely discouraging.

The army, as now existing, is assembled from every walk of life in our country. Every profession, trade, and calling, and every phase of religious belief and disbelief are represented. And with the feelings fresh from contact with social life, and with the still existing habits either of neglecting or attending on the institutions of religion, together with denominational preferences and prejudices in undiminished strength, the mass constituting a newly-formed regiment is found by the Chaplain to be in all these respects heterogeneous; and that the sole great and animating principle of union is, devotion to the sacred cause of our country. He will often find therein the pantheist, deist, rationalist, and universalist (and they in general not the most remarkable men in the regiment for taciturnity), and repeating the old cavil that the minister is only anxious about his pay; that religion is a humbug, and the like; and he will find likewise represented the Roman Catholic, and all the denominations of protestantism with their denominational preferences; and that in respect to not a few in the regiment, the denomination which he himself may represent, whatever that may be, is viewed with suspicion or prejudice; and that this is sometimes participated in not only by those who are members of churches, but who in their own denomination are regarded as truly pious and godly

men. Nor is this all; for he finds exceedingly prevalent in the army the idle and wicked notion that the duties devolving upon the soldier are incompatible with the duties of a religious life, and therefore that for the time being all attention to religion must be necessarily suspended. Hence he finds it extremely difficult, and often impossible, to learn who of his charge have ever made a profession of religion; and in his efforts to operate through the professed members of Christ's family, to get up a Bible-class, prayer-meeting, or evening-lecture, he is frequently frustrated. He must struggle on alone, very often, in all such efforts; and often when he brings such means of grace into operation, and begins to see the effect in the reëkindling of the fires of love to Christ in hearts that had been in a state of declension, the whole thing is for the time being arrested or broken in upon, by the necessary details for a march, scout, picket duty, and what not.

And then there are many of the men, who, though they would on no account consent to have the regiment destitute of a Chaplain, are yet backward about identifying themselves with him in his efforts; and require to be dealt with by a tact which is by no means the usual gift of the ministry, desirable as it certainly is. And the opportunity for private personal conversation can rarely be had, and in a manner never where the individual himself does not desire it. You visit them in the tents, and mingle with them at other times, but they are always in groups; except when sick or wounded in the hospital. True, a man of little sense and no experience in dealing with souls, would find no difficulty in any of these things; but the devoted and earnest and considerate minister of Christ can not but be brought often to a stand as to how to proceed, and what course to take in such circumstances; and deeply feels the necessity for constant prayer to the Fountain of all love and wisdom for direction. And then, moreover, agreeably to the military statutes, a Chaplain is not allowed to a regiment until its organization is in other respects complete. This provision, though important and perhaps necessary, yet in its operation can not but greatly enhance the obstacles in the way of a Chaplain's accomplishing the results at which he aims; that is, to bring the men under the saving influences of the Gospel, and to become instrumental in their conversion

and salvation. For it not unfrequently happens that the organization is not complete, until after a large proportion of the companies which constitute it have been for weeks or even months engaged in active service in the field. Where it is possible for one who may anticipate an appointment to the chaplaincy of a regiment, to be present with the officers and men from the incipency of its organization, which has sometimes been the case, and if the Chaplain's heart is truly in his work, the effect is marked, and decided, and delightful to contemplate. As pious men enter the regiment, they rejoice to find an opportunity to take their place in the prayer-meeting, Bible-class, at the evening-lecture, and at the public regimental service on the Sabbath; and also to coöperate with the minister of Christ (whom they expect to become their Chaplain) in everything whereby the spiritual interests of the regiment may be promoted. And this becomes the abiding disposition, and the work of conversion and sanctification still goes on, and its effects are perceived among the men everywhere. But when the reverse of this occurs, as it so frequently has in the exigencies of our war in the West, and when the companies, as fast as they are formed, are hurried to the field of carnage and death, the transition to a lukewarm condition in regard to divine things becomes fearfully easy, as facts so abundantly evince; the relish for the prayer-meeting and the other means of grace in a great measure ceases, and even attendance on the regular and prescribed Sabbath services gradually becomes a matter of mere form. The men having been for weeks or it may be months engaged in active service, fatiguing marches, and other duties which often greatly exhaust the vital energies, and being in the meanwhile deprived of all opportunity to attend the service of God or to enjoy the aforesaid means of grace, become in a lamentable degree habituated to the neglect of them, and when finally a Chaplain is assigned them, and when he enters upon the discharge of his duties, they regard the whole matter with indifference, and excuse themselves from taking any active part therein, or even from any seeming coöperation. Other ideas have taken possession of their minds, and they now pretend to have arrived at the conclusion that a profession of religion is incompatible with a soldier's duties, "not that

they have abandoned religion, as they say, no, they have merely suspended the performance of its duties for the time being, and when they leave the army they purpose to return again to the full performance of them." The effect is, the restraints of religion being thus thrown aside, the slightest temptation is found sufficient to enable sensuality and vice to resume their reign. We have known and been conversant with instances of this sort, the contemplation of which might make even angels weep. It can be easily seen how such a state of things must embarrass the faithful servant of God, and paralyze his efforts to do good. And then, further, if such are the effects upon the mass of those around whom the restraints of a religious profession have been thrown, when they are brought into the condition aforesaid, how fatally must the same causes operate upon those about whom there are no such restraints, but who have been moral and church-going people, respecters of religion and the like? The subject need not be dwelt upon, as every reflecting mind may easily imagine what the result would be. And in such cases we find instances innumerable, that all desire to attend the worship of God, and even all real interest in the matter of religion, have passed away from the mind and heart. And then, to complete the picture, it is necessary only to refer to the fact that the custom observed in the regular army and at the military posts of assembling the men and marching them to the place of worship, has been very extensively discontinued in the volunteer service; and that it is left optional with the men and officers whether to attend divine service or not.

The nature of the obstacles thus thrown in the way of the Chaplain, in his efforts to perform his work, may easily be understood and appreciated. For, as every man of observation and experience knows, the bare attempt to compel men against their will or inclination to listen to religious instruction, or to appeals made directly to them on religious subjects, can rarely be so made as to secure their serious attention; and, above all, when made in the presence of sneering and ungodly companions, is the sure way to frustrate the object at which we aim, and to awaken on the part of him we address either resentment or disgust.

We allude to these things, as already stated, merely to place

before the public the facts as they exist, and not for the purpose of discouraging any faithful God-fearing man from entering upon this field of labor. And it is the farthest from our intention to furnish excuses for negligence and indolence to any who may be already occupying the field. The difficulties and obstacles are great and formidable, *but they have been and they can be successfully encountered and obviated* by the faithful minister of Christ whose heart is in his work.

The difficulties to which we have referred may be found existing more or less in any portion of the army; but in the cavalry service (with which the writer is connected), there are often peculiar sources of discouragement, which perhaps can not be more appropriately presented than by referring to his own personal experience.

The regiment (MERRILL'S HORSE) of which he is Chaplain, and which, since the commencement of its organization in the summer of 1861, has been operating in North Missouri with great efficiency and success, was not completed, and of course had no Chaplain assigned to it until a large proportion of the companies of which it is constituted had been called into very active service in the field. And before he could signify his acceptance of the invitation to the chaplaincy, and enter upon the discharge of its duties, the men had in several severe actions encountered the enemy in battle. From what has been already stated in reference to this matter, our readers may easily perceive the result. The men, being without a spiritual counselor, and having little or no opportunity during that period to attend divine service, had become in many respects quite indifferent to the whole subject. Then when the regiment was fully formed, its companies, on account of the state of the country, were necessarily in some degree separated in order to occupy various important positions for the time being, with the view of operating most effectually in quelling the spirit of insurrection which was rife through the whole of the section which had been assigned to them. During the greater part of the past year some five or six stations were thus occupied, and at each of them the most active and decided operations were continually necessary. The youthful but thoroughly accomplished and heroic commander of the regiment, who from the very outset had, with

an assiduity unwearied and untiring, trained and disciplined his men, until they could be brought to operate with a terrible efficiency, which has made their name a terror to the disloyal element in the district; and having to a great extent introduced the *regime* of the regular service into his regiment, it can be easily supposed how severe in such circumstances must have been the labors devolving upon the men in standing guard, picket duty, and in scouting, foraging, fighting with and pursuing the enemy often for days or weeks at a time; and it can easily be imagined how difficult, under such circumstances, a Chaplain's duty must become.

He must, moreover, visit all parts of the regiment, passing from place to place where its companies are for the time being stationed; and this, on account of the disloyalty of a large portion of the population, could rarely be performed without considerable escort, which, in our small camps, would enhance the fatigue and toil of the men. And then, oftentimes after making persevering efforts to interest a sufficient portion of the men in the subject to constitute a Bible-class or prayer-meeting, you find on going to the appointed place that the majority of those who thus began to evince an interest in these matters have been detailed suddenly for a scout or some other important service, or that their turn has come for picket duty or to stand sentinel; while frequently we are placed in circumstances where there is no house of worship, so that on stormy days or in winter we are forced to employ a tent, which can, of course, accommodate but a very limited number; and thus we are forced to go over our work many and many times, and often when we imagine that it is getting under way, all our plans are rendered inoperative for a time.

In further illustration we here add an extract from a letter written by the earnest and devoted Chaplain of Harris' Cavalry, in the Army of the Potomac, and which was published in the New York Evangelist of March 19. After dwelling upon the general subject of life in the camp, he proceeds to say:

"The greatest hardship of the soldier's life in winter is picket duty. For instance, our whole brigade recently assigned to Colonel Killpatrick, left their comfortable quarters a few mornings ago, and went out on

picket duty for ten days. A cold wet snow filled the air, clung to and dampened everything. It settled on one's hair and neck, melted and ran down his back, producing a general feeling of discomfort. As the men formed preparatory to marching, their uniforms of blue rapidly changed to white, and as they filed off in the dim morning light they presented a shadowy ghost-like appearance. When you realize what it is to march eighteen or twenty miles in such a storm over horrible roads, and then form a cordon of pickets twenty miles long in a wild, desolate country, you have some idea of the not unusual experience of a soldier.

"When he reaches his destination, it is not a disagreeable journey over, and comfortable quarters in which to dry and refresh himself. All his conditions of comfort are carried on his person or strapped to his saddle, and he is thankful even for the shelter of a pine woods. Immediately on arrival, without time for rest, a large detachment must form the picket line, and stand over on the alert from two to four hours at a time, be it day or night. It should not be forgotten during these long winter evenings when the stormy wind sweeps and howls around your comfortable dwellings, that among the wild woods and hills of Virginia, or on the plains of the far West, the patient sentinel walks his desolate beat or sits like an equestrian statue on his horse, thus forming with his own chilled and weary frame a living breastwork and defense for your homes. Pray for him, that during these long lonely hours of hardship and danger our merciful God may excite within his mind thoughts of that better life and happier world where the weary are at rest—where even the names of enemy and war are forgotten."

These and similar facts may give some idea of the difficulty of maintaining anything like regular and stated religious services among the men, or of operating according to any fixed plan whatever, much less of following out the stupid suggestions of those who, without ever having seen a camp, undertake to prescribe the manner in which everything should be performed. And when there is taken into consideration how great is the influence of custom or habit in keeping up religious observances in social life itself, and that in the army and in the frequent absence of stated religious services the influences brought to bear in social life cease more or less to operate, its ties being in a certain sense severed for the time; and how all the aforesaid obstacles must tend to frustrate the efforts of the Chaplain to accomplish that kind of work which is needed for the spiritual benefit of his charge, the difficulties which beset his path may be to some extent appreciated.

We do not wish to dwell upon this point with unnecessary minuteness, but the exigency of the occasion demands some direct and plain remarks in the connection. Let any competent mind seriously contemplate the minister of Christ entering upon such a field. There is no such thing as a pastoral relation, with its reciprocal duties and obligations, existing or acknowledged by those committed to his charge; and in respect to that charge itself, there is existing no principle of association, but on the contrary, and as regards the religious element, so far as it is actually developed therein, he finds in a great measure the denominational preferences and prejudices which exist in social life alive and operative, and with such human aids and instrumentalities to coöperate with him, he enters upon the duties of his charge, that charge consisting of one thousand men and upward, together with their sick and wounded in the hospital; and in that charge, assembled as it has been from every walk of life, and on the single principle of loyalty to the Constitution and Government, he finds along with the perhaps faint development of the religious element, utter indifferentism to religion, and all forms of faith and unbelief, and too often those who profess the name of Christ not only unwilling to coöperate with him in his efforts, but disgracing religion by the most shameful backslidings, and justifying themselves on the plea that the life of a soldier is incompatible with a religious life; and while they rarely are willing to be approached by a clergyman, he has little or no opportunity to converse with them alone and privately, except when they desire it, and no method by which they may be brought, even on the Sabbath, under the preaching of the Gospel, attendance thereon being left entirely optional with themselves. In view of all these, and a hundred other things which could be enumerated, all requiring tact and time and perseverance and the most unfaltering energy to obviate, is it strange that great results have not already accrued from the Chaplain's labors? or that many good and eminently qualified men should hesitate to enter upon that office? or, that of the noble band of faithful men who have entered it, not a few should have found their health utterly fail in the work? and that others should at times almost yield to discouragement? And is it surprising, moreover, that when this

accumulation of the most formidable trials and obstacles is enhanced by the expressions of impatience, or of implied censure, and even sometimes of denunciation through public meetings or the press, from persons professing to be friends of the Redeemer and his cause, who yet are as ignorant as a post of the whole subject they pretend to discuss, is it remarkable that not a few able and faithful men should have become hopeless of accomplishing anything for Christ in such a field?

It is high time that the Christian community should cease to countenance this spirit of intermeddling, which, without effecting the least good, works evil, and only evil, and that continually; and as it ought not to be passed over in this general discussion of the whole subject, so we shall here improve the occasion to administer a rebuke which we trust may be effectual.

We have alluded to the remark of General Howard, at a meeting in Washington, and the unfortunate application which it has been made to bear, and to the fact that constructions have been put upon his language which were entirely foreign from the mind of that gallant and meritorious officer. General Howard unquestionably will admit that with the exceptions specified by us above, there is now in the army a large number of men sustaining the office of Chaplain, who, while they are, as respects patriotism and devotion to the great cause of freedom, second to no other men in the army, are as earnest and diligent and self-denying in performing the duties of their office as ministers of Christ, as General Howard and his brave associates are in performing the duties devolving upon them in their own department. Of the truth of this representation there is not room for a reasonable doubt. And, then, moreover, there are ways and methods for remedying the abuses and removing the difficulties aforesaid without unnecessarily increasing them, as can not but be done by unguarded remarks on the subject; for we do regard the remark attributed to General Howard as unguarded. And we have no hesitation to say that a communicating of the fact to the Christian community that a large proportion of the regiments of his command were destitute of the ministrations of the Gospel, with the expression of a wish on his part that they might be supplied (unaccompanied, however, by the uncalled-for and

discouraging statement that the chaplaincy was a failure) would have soon resulted in his procuring from among the best and ablest pastors in our country a volunteer supply for those regiments, until methods would have been adopted to render the supply permanent.

We attribute to General Howard no design or intention inconsistent with the sincerest and most devout attachment to the religion of Christ. We cherish his name with affectionate regard; for his life is, and, ever since his entrance into the West Point Academy, has been a standing refutation of the calumny that the life of a soldier is incompatible with a life of earnest devotion to Christ and his cause. But his remark (not as it was intended but as it has been applied) has been made the occasion for renewing in every part of the country the old tirades of abuse against chaplaincy in the army; and thus the spirit of impertinent intermeddling has been encouraged. For it has been so from the beginning, that the earnest, God-fearing, devoted men who occupy this office in our armies, have had not only the aforesaid obstacles to encounter in the performance of their work, and have found but little sympathy with them either in their charge or out of it; but, also, that they have had to stand up against "a fire in the rear," proceeding not alone from atheists and infidels and other despisers of religion, and from such little would-be wits as "Orpheus C. Cur," but from the thoughtless and inconsiderate remarks of some who are friends of Christ, and who seem to be truly desirous to promote the spiritual and eternal interests of our gallant soldiers. But, to make the whole matter perfectly plain, we shall here adduce a single instance out of many in illustration of our meaning. It is the one first occurring to mind, though others not less forcible can be presented.

At a large and enthusiastic demonstration on behalf of the army, held in St. Louis, Missouri (a report of which may be found in the *Daily Missouri Democrat*, of March 24, 1863), one of the speakers, a Mr. Brownell (reported as a "Corresponding Secretary and Agent of the Western Army Committee"), who had been spending several weeks with a part of our army in the South, undertakes, in view of such a remarkable experience, to enlighten the community on the subject of army life, duties of Chaplains, and the like, of which he

practically could have known nothing at all; and after referring with just commendation to an excellent post Chaplain in Fort Pickering—the Rev. J. Porter—he proceeds in the following strain:

“Immediately following the bloody carnage at Shiloh, almost a year since, I was privileged to assist Brother Porter and wife, with others, in unloading the City of Memphis, at Mound City Hospital. Soon after three o'clock in the morning, we went among that seven hundred and fifty, with every conceivable wound. What sights, what sounds, what looks, what utterances! Till seven in the evening, did that faithful husband and wife bend in almost parental affection over those wounded and dying men. *How many times I have wondered why there were so few such Chaplains! Is it not in large part answered, because they do not labor personally for the salvation of their men?*”

The only thing which could justify our attaching the slightest importance to such an utterance, is the position occupied by the speaker as connected with an important benevolent enterprise, the respectability of the audience, and the fact, moreover, that the remark, inane and senseless, and uncalled for, as it seems to be, is only an echo of what had been with equal thoughtlessness and ignorance of the facts, repeated substantially many times before. The remark, besides confounding the duties of a hospital or post Chaplain with those of the Chaplain in the field, openly announces that there are but few of the noble band of our faithful and devoted Chaplains who possess the very ordinary humanity to bestow in a like case to the one referred to, equal and affectionate attention upon their wounded and dying brethren! If this be not its meaning, then the remark is without meaning, and is a mere senseless and inane utterance, perverting and misapplying a fact in order to fabricate an occasion for joining in the clamor which ignorance has been attempting to raise against this class of officers in the army. But if, on the contrary, this be its meaning, as it seems impossible to doubt, then it is one of the most unfounded and atrocious calumnies that was ever uttered against a minister of Christ. And on behalf of the faithful and self-denying band of godly ministers who have freely left the comforts of home to minister to our noble soldiery amid the perils and discomforts of the camp

and field, we pronounce it an unmitigated falsehood and slander. A spirit which can in this manner either thoughtlessly or maliciously assail these servants of God, overburdened as they already are by toil and care in the discharge of their responsibilities, should not only receive no countenance among Christian men, but should be sternly rebuked out of existence. Many of our men receive and read the published accounts of such proceedings. And though it be true that such statements and declarations can do but little injury among those who are acquainted with the facts, and who sympathize with the Chaplain in his toils and labors; they do immense harm to those whose consciences begin to trouble them on the subject of religion, and who are ever on the alert to find reasons to justify their neglect of its claims, and of the appeals made to them by the faithful minister of Christ. In a like manner, also, it affects the openly impenitent. A general charge is made, as in this case, that Chaplains are unfaithful. These men being willing to think so, do not trouble themselves to inquire whether the charge is true or not, but taking for granted that it would not be made without reason, act accordingly; and from the time that this idea gains possession of them the power of the Chaplain to do them good is gone forever. And thus a slander, thoughtlessly uttered, effects all the injury which it could do, were it to proceed from deep-seated malignity.

It is quite in place to add here, also, that in most of the voluntary societies of Christian benevolence, the mere official is too often prone to forget his place. He forgets that he is not the society itself, but only its servant for the time it may choose to employ him. Not a few of the Christian enterprises of the age have been impaired in their efficiency and brought to the very verge of ruin, by the attempts of their officials to intermeddle with matters which are quite beyond or beside the scope of the duties assigned to them. The spirit is similar in manifestation to that which so often shows itself in churches; where certain individuals, often the least qualified and most illiterate, undertake to think and act for the rest—pastor and all—so that a pastor's labors must be performed in exact accordance with their senseless notions, or he is denounced as unfaithful; and from that time forth must encounter the full

amount of their hostility. In such a case who can doubt that such an intrusion is an outrage? Every pastor feels it to be so. The church has intrusted its work to him, and he is responsible for its performance. If he needs counsel he will ask it. And in the exercise of common privilege, he will prefer to seek it of those whom he thinks are really able to impart it. The attempt to force it upon him on the part of those whose ability to render it he can not but regard as more than questionable, is of very little use except to introduce confusion and disorder. So, too, as respects the matter before us.

Much has been frequently said in the same connection, and with equal want of discrimination, about "laboring personally" with the men for their salvation. And rules are not unfrequently laid down for guidance in the matter by those who, on the score of practical knowledge, prudence, or remarkable preëminence in any of the Christian virtues, are the least qualified to advert to the subject at all. But any one who will cast his eye over the aforesaid specification of the obstacles in the way of the Chaplain, as he enters upon his field, with ten or twelve hundreds of men under his charge, will not need that we here stop in order to repel such presumption. The gifts of Christ's ministers are various. But every true minister will, on surveying his field, pursue that course in which he believes he can accomplish most good. The matter should be left to him, without subjecting him to the annoyance of dictation and intermeddling on the part of those who, while they sustain no portion of the mighty burden of his responsibilities, are in no way capacitated to offer him either counsel or suggestion. Should a similar intermeddling be attempted in the case of the Surgeons, Captains, Colonels, or of any other officers in the army, its authors would soon be taught, and in a way that would insure the remembrance of the lesson, that it became them to confine their attention to matters which are legitimately within the scope of their talents and attainments. Let us hope that there may be no occasion ever to refer to this subject again.

The aforesaid methods of interference have been long indulged in; and, while they have accomplished and could accomplish no good whatever, have done evil, and only evil, to

the souls of men. From the very first call for an army, a considerable class, including all the foes of vital godliness, have opposed the appointment of Chaplains, as they still oppose the like appointment to Congress and to our State Legislatures. Not a few united in the opposition who would not like to be identified with that class of persons, because they themselves profess to have some regard for religion. It will be remembered, also, how, almost from the very beginning of the present war, this spirit showed itself; and how that, to some extent, a portion of even the religious press incautiously permitted itself to become the organ for its utterances. The office was decried, and insinuations thrown out indiscriminately against its occupants. It is a principle with officers in the army, and very extensively acted upon, to pass in silence assaults upon them from the people, whom they are laboring to serve; for they would rather suffer in silence than to give the common enemy possession of the facts which are necessary for their own vindication; and, though this principle does not, to the same extent, apply to Chaplains, and the subject under discussion, we have rejoiced to find that they have so extensively acted upon it. Nor should we have referred to the matter at all, except that it was unavoidable in a full and proper treatment of the whole subject under discussion. But we have been glad to find that in general no notice has been taken of these things by the faithful and devoted band of men who were thus assailed. They have quietly toiled on amid the obstacles which beset them, looking to God to follow their labors with his blessing. Here and there death has summoned one and another from their work, either by disease or by some missile of the foe, while they were animating their compatriots in battle, or ministering to the wounded and dying on the field, while others, through utter prostration from disease, contracted by exposures in the camp and on the march, have been obliged to retire from the work they loved. But, as a class, they have prayerfully borne, in patience and silence, all that this spirit of intermeddling and calumny has brought upon them: regarding the time as not having come when the whole matter would be set right with the Christian community. That time has, perhaps, not yet arrived; but it will come, and, while they patiently wait for it, they ask the

Church to give itself more fully to the work of supplying the army with the ministrations of the Gospel.

In respect to the best method of successfully encountering the aforesaid obstacles, it may be expected that we should here offer a word. But it is obvious at a glance that he who enters upon this field of labor should be brought fully to realize that his strength and resources in doing his work are preëminently in God. If he does not realize this, he has no business here; and if he does, he shall find that he does not labor and pray and hope in vain. Let him not only stand ready to improve the opportunities which may occur, but let him seek them amid all his discouragements, and he will often be surprised to find how God will go before him and make his path plain. If I may again refer to my own experience, I may be permitted to say that, notwithstanding all the forenamed difficulties which operated long and discouragingly, we have had many most precious seasons of interest in the regiment. And, not to speak particularly of the regular and prescribed regimental services on the Sabbath, never have I enjoyed more delightful religious services than we have had in the prayer-meetings, Bible-classes and familiar evening-lectures in the regiment. Small, indeed, was the number attending at first; and though often interrupted and, as already remarked, for awhile suspended, yet still kept up with increasing numbers and interest, and as delightful as I have ever enjoyed, or expect to enjoy, on this side Heaven. We have a noble regiment, and one of the best disciplined and most effective in the service. And words would fail me, were I to attempt to describe the emotions of my soul as I have joined in the songs of praise, and listened to and united in the earnest prayers of the heroic men who had stood undaunted, in our country's cause, upon frequent fields of carnage and of death.

And here I must say a word respecting those blessed efforts of the people of God who have labored so assiduously to supply the army with appropriate reading. What an incalculably precious help has this effort proved to the Chaplain in his work! A thousand and a thousand times have I had occasion to say from the deepest recesses of my heart, "*God bless them!*" in view of their abundant and most appropriate helps. Nothing could be more appropriate. The soldier can carry but little

with him besides his necessary equipage, and those neat and beautiful little testaments and hymn books are just the thing. And then the other beautiful little volumes, whose subjects are so admirably chosen—how much good have they done, in instances without number! And, likewise, the little tracts of the same character, which, after perusal, the soldier can inclose in a letter and send as a remembrancer to his loved ones at home, to whom any such thing which has been read and sent by the dear absent husband, or parent, or brother, or child afar off in camp, is such a treasure, and is read and re-read so lovingly by all the family. Never was the spirit of Christian liberality more thoughtfully and more successfully employed in sowing the seed of divine truth. And again we say, from our inmost heart, God bless the noble men and women who have thus thought of and cared and provided for the brave and gallant men who have so freely responded to their country's call, and stepped forth to the fields of battle and of death to defend her from the foe.

A Chaplain, moreover, should make it a great point to secure, as soon as possible, the confidence of the men of his regiment in his integrity of purpose and unfaltering desire to do them good. Let them become fully assured of this fact, and that he is one with them in hardships, privations, and perils, and he can, in a manner, do anything with them.

It was a most unfortunate circumstance for the chaplaincy of the whole army, and to which reference was made with terrible effect by the public press, when, more than a year ago, sundry Chaplains in a portion of the Eastern Army, which was about to move on to battle, concluded that it was not necessary for them to accompany it, and acted accordingly. It is true that the Chaplain, no more than the Surgeon, is necessarily required to go upon the field of battle; but it is, at the same time, true that the Chaplain who, in the sphere of obvious duty, will allow a regard to personal safety to determine or influence his actions, has no business in the army. He who would hesitate to accompany the brave men of his regiment when they are moving forward to bleed and die, if needs be, for their country, and, lest he should be exposed to danger, allow the wounded and dying to remain without the ministrations of religion, had better resign his office and go

home. The idea of a minister of Christ thus fearing death, and in such a cause, and shrinking from the post of ministering to those who need his ministrations, and that, too, when multitudes, who are not even professors of religion, go forth joyfully to face death in the sacred cause for which we war, is too humiliating to be dwelt upon. In such an hour, a knowledge of the fact that the Chaplain is near at hand is always a great satisfaction to the men. If he prefer not to go into the field of battle and minister to the wounded and dying as they fall, he yet should ever be near the Surgeon to whom they are brought. And it would have been far better for the army, and for the cause of our country, had those brethren all been slain in the attempt thus to do their duty, than that they should have adopted the resolution referred to. I know of nothing which so effectually opened the hearts of the men of my regiment to my efforts to do them good, as little events like the following, which I trust I may be pardoned for briefly alluding to, in the way of illustration: On several occasions when, at some of our stations, we were momentarily expecting an attack from an overwhelming force, said to be close upon us, I have lighted my pipe (for, to my shame be it spoken, that I have not yet abandoned the unjustifiable practice of smoking) and moved deliberately along the line of battle, conversing familiarly with the men, or addressing them in words of cheerfulness and animation. On one occasion, as I remember, after some new recruits, who had never met the enemy, had been received, the camp was suddenly aroused at midnight, and the men called upon to form immediately for battle, in view of an impending attack; and the gallant officer who commanded that portion of the line where the new recruits were stationed, observing that they appeared to be somewhat excited, called my attention to the fact, and requested me to speak with them. I did so, and, after addressing them for a few moments, found them not only calm and ready, but eager to evince their zeal in the hallowed cause of their country. These and a few other incidents, somewhat similar, wherein, also, duty called upon me to act, have not only removed the effects of the influence of such examples as the aforesaid from my regiment, but have given me an influence over the most

inapproachable of our men which it would have taken a long time to obtain in any other way.

As regards the specific duties of the Chaplain, the law under which he is appointed has, and, we think, wisely, said but little on the subject. He receives his appointment as a recognized minister of the Gospel, is supposed to understand his duties as such, and is expected to perform them. The spiritual interests and welfare of the regiment, so far as a clergyman can take them in charge, are intrusted to him; and the sick and wounded are, in the same sense, committed to his oversight. It is not only not to be supposed that an authorized minister of the Lord Jesus Christ could be at any loss how to proceed in such circumstances, but it is to be supposed that he would know, and that he would need little or no instruction in the matter. And hence, as already stated, the Government is concerned in appointing him to the field to do the work of a true and faithful clergyman, and not in prescribing his duties. In a late earnest appeal to the churches, by the New York Committee of the United States Christian Commission, to supply the army more fully with the ministrations of the Gospel, it is said that "the law under which Chaplains are appointed, defines no position, gives no protection, and *prescribes no duties*; so that the best men are liable to discouragements, under unfavorable local influences, and the religious interests of the army must be imperfectly provided for, until the law is modified." But we can not think that the representation is justified by the facts. For, as to his position and duties, they are those which appertain to him as a minister of Christ. The Government recognizes him as sustaining this position, and commissions him to perform its duties in the army; and, in the same connection, earnestly recommends all officers and soldiers to attend Divine service. Our enemies, also, are enjoined, by the highest official authority, to respect the Sabbath, and the hour for Divine service has also been suggested. By his commission, he is an officer of the army; his pay is indicative of his rank; and he is authorized to place any one under arrest who should attempt to interfere with him in the discharge of his legitimate duties. At least so we have always understood and acted, and no one has ever ques-

tioned our full right to do so. That the "Regulations" respecting the chaplaincy may be improved, is, no doubt, true; but we do seriously question whether the attempt to prescribe its specific duties would result in anything but embarrassment and confusion. The truth is, the men themselves not only fully understand the position of the Chaplain as a minister of Christ, but expect him to perform his duty as such. And it is a grievous mistake to suppose that he will forfeit his influence with his charge by strict and undeviating faithfulness in the discharge of those duties. Such is not the fact, though the reverse, however, is true. They expect him to be faithful; and no congregation in the world is more quick to discern any lack of faithfulness, or any inconsistency in deportment. The Gospel commends itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God; and the Chaplain who will not only preach the Gospel, but exhibit it in his intercourse with his charge, can not but effect great good among them. They do not expect him to connive at sin, or wink at immorality; but to reprove, rebuke and exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine. A contrary course will at once end all his influence as a minister of Christ, and effectually check all his power to do them good. I have now been with the army since December, 1861, and though, as all will testify, I have never hesitated to rebuke vice and sin, I have yet to receive the first unkind or insulting word from any one of the regiment, with the single exception of a man who was intoxicated, and knew not what he was doing.

And then, finally, to conclude what we have to say respecting the difficulties of this field of labor and the best method of surmounting them, it will be observed that when the aforesaid obstacles have been surmounted, the exhausting drain upon the Chaplain's time and energies has, in a measure, just begun. For when his labors and prayers and watchings begin, by the divine blessing, to produce their result, and the men begin to evince an interest in the subject of religion, he feels that notwithstanding all he has heretofore done, his labors and anxieties are but commencing. For now will the perpetual calling upon him at his tent for private conversation and counsel, and the desire expressed for religious services

and visits at the tents (other conveniences being out of reach), and his vain attempts to visit and converse with all who desire it, he finds incomparably more to do than he can perform. And with all his anxiety to do his whole work, he will feel that some are neglected. He must be at his tent at the hours when the men generally are off duty, to receive their calls; he must visit them at their tents; he must be at the hospital, for the sick and wounded can not be neglected; he must prepare for and attend his Bible-class, evening-lecture, and the prayer-meeting. He must likewise prepare for his regimental service on the Sabbath day, and for the services in the hospital; for a regiment is not the congregation for any man to attempt to address without thoughtful and adequate preparation. Often is the Chaplain compelled to exclaim, "Who is sufficient for these things!" and full often have I felt like sitting down and weeping to find so little accomplished of all that I saw needing to be done, and which I had in vain endeavored to perform.

I have not overdrawn these representations. And now, in view of them, and the multitude of other and not less important facts which I have been compelled to omit, the question comes up before the Christian Church and public, What is to be done in the premises? The army has not only been greatly overlooked by a large portion of the Church as a benevolent field for enterprise, but the nature of the field itself has been greatly misapprehended. The question has to a considerable extent arisen in the public mind, whether the chaplaincy system had not better be abolished, and be made to give place to some other provision which might better secure the desired result. It would, perhaps, have been wiser first to have determined whether there is or can be devised any such substitute. As we are not willing, however, to share the responsibility of those who are attempting to abolish it, we shall in conclusion offer a few remarks on the general question, expressive of our views.

No proof can be derived against the system (as we have sufficiently shown), from the fact that insufficient, incompetent and even immoral persons have been appointed to the office. Such a state of things was perhaps unavoidable at the time of

its occurrence, and will pass away with the emergency which called it into being, and it can require but little care hereafter to prevent a recurrence of the like.

One of the worst and most reprehensible suggestions in relation to the matter, and which is the more surprising as emanating from a professed minister of Christ, is that preaching the Gospel is only secondary and of comparatively little account in the army. If this be so, then there is no necessity why ministers of the Gospel should leave their charges in order to occupy the office of Chaplain; a faithful colporteur would answer as well. But we have not space to enlarge on the point, further than to say that while it is God's plan "to save men by the foolishness of preaching," there are multitudes in nearly every regiment, who will pay no heed to religious services which are not conducted by a recognized clergyman. We may regret this, but such is the fact.

We hold and maintain, without the slightest hesitation, that the bare suggestion, come from what source it may, that our noble and gallant army might be on any account whatever left without the regular and authorized ministrations of religion, is criminal in a high degree. Why should it be so left? Is it because of the expense attending the effort to supply them? The man who, taking all things into consideration, should venture to assert such a thing, would deserve to be branded with undying infamy. Is it, then, on account of the obstacles in the way of properly cultivating the field itself? But this is no reason, as we have fully shown. Will the Church herself, then, plead that she is unable to supply those ministrations; and that the army, therefore, must be left without them? Nothing would more surely indicate that the spirit of Christ no longer dwelt in his Church, than the announcement of a conclusion like this. What Christian mind could for a moment tolerate the thought that the heroic men who, at their country's sacred call, have so freely stepped forth into the deadly breach to defend her at the hazard of life itself, may be left in such circumstances without the stated and authorized ministration of the means of grace, not because it is really impossible to supply them, but because it would require on the part of the Church some considerable effort and sacrifice to do so? In

the name of our gallant army itself, and on behalf of the loved and cherished ones whom they have left at home, and in the name and on behalf of our innumerable wounded, and sick, and dying; and of the multitude who are yet destined to perish before this cruel strife shall end, we protest against such a thought, and against the lukewarmness with which the whole matter has been in a great measure regarded. And let the precious memory of our heroic and martyred dead put to shame and lasting silence the spirit of utilitarianism which would still attempt to place obstacles in the way.

We thank God that at length there is on this subject a movement, and in the right direction. And we rejoice that the noble body constituting the CHRISTIAN COMMISSION, whose unwearied toils and sacrifices for the good of the army will ever be remembered as conferring honor upon the age and country, have also taken this matter in hand. The late stirring appeal made to the churches by the New York Committee of that Commission should be deeply pondered by every church and clergyman in the land. The plan which it proposes, though designed only to be temporary in its operation, is yet the very best thing to be done in the present circumstances, for it both admits and calls for immediate action; and while it is in operation, time will be afforded to the Church herself for further deliberation, and to devise means for meeting the requirements of the case, which shall be at least more lasting and permanent. We append the plan itself, in the conclusion of what we can now offer on the subject (for our article is already by many pages longer than we had designed), and trust that its recommendations will receive the prayerful and prompt consideration of all the churches and ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ in our country:

THE NEW YORK COMMITTEE OF THE U. S. CHRISTIAN COMMISSION propose the following plan, earnestly requesting its immediate consideration by clerical bodies, Pastors and Churches, and respectfully urging the promptest action:

1. The voluntary enlistment of at least one minister of the Gospel, of talent, position, and approved adaptation to this special service, for each brigade in the army—say 300 in all—during a period of two or

three months each. Every city or large town can spare one Pastor, at least—and *the best one*—for this noble work; his pulpit being supplied by his ministerial brethren of the same or of different denominations in rotation, or otherwise. Each considerable ecclesiastical body can thus detail a representative for the army.

2. Each volunteer Chaplain may be accompanied by a layman from his own or a neighboring congregation, under appointment as a Delegate of the Christian Commission, who shall aid in the distribution of the Scriptures, tracts, newspapers, and camp and hospital stores, and in holding meetings, or visiting the sick and wounded.

3. The service thus proposed should be gratuitous; but the Christian Commission will defray all expenses of Pastor and Delegate going to, returning from, and while on the field, and furnish all needed publications, stores, and other means of usefulness. On this system:

The Army would have a demonstration of the benevolence of the Gospel, and of its ambassadors. The very presence of a reputable, experienced preacher of Christ in the camp, on the one errand of salvation, with no earthly reward, would be a living sermon. Able and earnest appeals to the consciences of officers and men, sobered by the exposures and disappointments of war, from esteemed Pastors whose congregations have *lent* them for this mission of Christian charity, and whose motives to effort could not be questioned, must have great power. It would infuse new animation into the army. There is reason to believe that such labors would be universally welcomed by officers and soldiers.

The Pastors and Churches might expect a blessing on their joint self-denial.

The Country needs the example of Christian patriotism and devotion to so grand a spiritual object, as a counterpoise to the selfishness and spirit of faction so unhappily prevalent.

The Christianity of the country needs, for its own invigoration and revival, such a demonstration of unselfish vigor as would be afforded by the simultaneous devotion of three hundred of its ablest preachers to the volunteer chaplaincy service, among half a million of needy, waiting, dying souls.

30 Bible House, New York, March 3, 1863.

ART. V.—*The Puritans and their Principles*, by Edwin Hall.
New York: Chas. Scribner. 1851.*

THIS is a volume of four hundred and forty pages, 8vo. In his advertisement, the author says:

“The following lectures were delivered to the First Congregational Society in Norwalk, Connecticut, in the latter part of 1843 and early in 1844. They are designed to set forth the causes which brought the pilgrims to these shores; to exhibit their principles; to show what these principles are worth, and what it cost to maintain them; to vindicate the character of the Puritans from the aspersions which have been cast upon them; to show the Puritanic system of church polity, as distinguished from the prelatie, broadly and solidly based on the Word of God; inseparable from religious purity and religious freedom.”

In accomplishing this, the author found it necessary to “enter to some extent, and with some minuteness, upon the history of the Puritans and of their times; to trace their progress from the discovery of one important principle to another; to exhibit them in their sufferings; to trace the pilgrims in their wanderings to their landing upon these then desolate shores.” To these lectures is appended a review of “Puritanism,” “or a Churchman’s Defense against its aspersions, by Thos. W. Coit, D. D., Rector of Trinity Church, New Rochelle, N. Y.” The careful reading of these lectures has satisfied us that Mr. Hall has performed, well and thoroughly, the task which he imposed upon himself in their aim, general outline, and execution, and made us feel that it is a pleasant thing to see the light—that it is much more pleasant to see the sun of truth in all his beauty, than to stand in the twilight—upon the dim line which separates between twilight and darkness, so dimly that it can not be perceived where darkness ends or twilight begins. It is refreshing, in the present time, to meet and converse with one who is so intimate with the history of, and so fully in sympathy with, such men and such principles as Mr. Hall here so ably vindicates;

* OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Neal’s History of the Puritans; Macaulay’s History of England; Hodge’s History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States; Foot’s Sketches of Virginia and North Carolina; Princeton Review, January, 1850.

and rising from his entertainment we feel that "no man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth the new, for, saith he, the old is better." Being delivered in vindication of their subjects, these lectures are necessarily spiced with controversy. Throughout there is kept up a running fire upon the high claims of the British Crown in matters spiritual; upon the spirit of the English hierarchy, and upon the pretensions of prelacy in the United States; and after taking such a view of the Puritans and their principles as our author treats us to, in which we are made to see and to feel that the age of the Puritans was truly *magnatum* among the centuries, and that they made the times, in which they lived, great by their principles, and by their zeal and sufferings for the same, we realize that it is next to impossible to write up Puritanism without at the same time writing down prelacy, because of their inherent antagonism, and are prepared to enter into all the depth and strength of feeling bordering upon just scorn and contempt, which is excited in Mr. Hall while sketching the high claims and the high doings of the Crown and English hierarchy against the Puritans, and while reviewing what another has called "the frivolous and ill-natured work of Mr. Coit."

We find in these lectures a character of information and a service to the interests of truth which our present times much need; and in them we hear this generation virtually called upon to "stand in the way, and see, and ask for the old paths—where is the good way?—and walk therein, and ye shall find rest to your souls." Not that all old things are good, nor that anything is good because old, for that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to perish, but that the principles of the Puritans were manifestly those of the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever, and such as men can not reject without rejecting the very words of eternal life; nor that we should ask, "why were the former days better than these?" there being many reasons why such a question would not be wise in our mouth, and yet we know not that it would be anything amiss were many, in this time, to make an application of this question to themselves; charging upon their hearts the evils which the question by implication charges upon the times; and to the fruits of their own acts and the influences which the principles they are advocating are now exerting upon the

public morals, upon the national interests, and upon the state of religion in this land. For that each generation of men has failed to duly honor such as were sent specially to them in the name of the Lord, if they have not also rejected and stoned them, is a fact which is usually overlooked. That God has had from the beginning one path of duty for his people to walk in, one set of principles of faith and practice for them to maintain, cherish, act upon and inculcate, and, if need be, suffer for, and that this one way has not been delighted in by the great masses of mankind, and that these principles have been usually rejected and contemned when seriously and earnestly contended for and urged upon the hearts of mankind, is a fact not duly borne in mind; and that "we ought to obey God rather than men," seems to be a truth which has grown so old as to have become totally forgotten by many, though it be one of those truths which live and abide forever, though it be as valuable and important now as when first clearly perceived and distinctly asserted by the apostles when straitly charged by the ruling powers of their day not to preach, nor to teach at all in the name of Jesus Christ, and though all that is worth living for in the shape of civil and religious liberty, has come of God's people standing by this truth and sticking up to it, in their several generations, and dying for it rather than renounce it.

There always have been difficulties in the way of getting a true estimate of the Puritans and their principles into the minds of many. One of these has been the kind of men who have written of them, and whose writings have been most popular with the mass of readers. Some of these were morally incompetent to understand the real character of the Puritans, and others have written as though they had a divine calling to asperse them. Able pens have made it clear that Hume, Macaulay, and others, were not morally qualified to appreciate the motives, the ends, and the objects for which such men as Wickliffe, Cranmer, Latimer, Tyndal, Coverdale, Rogers, Hooper, Ridley, Knox, Cartwright, and others, struggled through those interesting and exciting times in which they lived and acted. While the Puritans were men eminently religious, taught of God, and having an unction from the Holy One, and strove for the rights of conscience, for the priv-

ilege of worshipping God according to his pure word, and the guidings of his Spirit those whose writings have done most to fix the notions of the mass of mankind touching these people, have been men who saw nothing worth contending for in the religion of Jesus Christ, and had about as much sympathy with paganism as with Christianity—at least, with the corruptest form of Christianity as with the purest. Sketches by such writers, drawn of such men, could not fail to be gross caricatures. Of Hume, Mr. Hall says:

“He spares no pains to stigmatize them as zealots whose principles appear frivolous, and whose habits were ridiculous. But Hume was a cold-blooded infidel, peculiarly bitter against Christianity in its evangelical form. To judge of the principles of evangelical religion as distinguished from a religion of superstitious forms and splendid rituals, Hume was incompetent. He could not understand the spirit that wrought in the Puritans, and hence his view of their activity was turbulence, their firmness willfulness, their zeal fanaticism—whether the principles of the Gospel be preserved in their purity; whether impositions inconsistent with the Gospel be laid aside; whether the Church of God shall be severed from the dominion of mere worldly politicians; whether the Gospel and its ordinances, given by the toils and blood of the Son of God, shall be left as he gave them, simple and pure, with power to secure the great ends for which they were given—these are matters for which Hume cares not, and concerning which he makes no inquiry. How lamentable that his opinions on these subjects should enstamp themselves on so many minds, and form, with scarcely a question of their accuracy, the prevailing sentiments of a large portion of the world!”

Of Macaulay, the Princeton Review of January, 1850, says:

“In many parts there are clear indications that he wants what we deem an essential qualification in a historian of those eventful times, deep and earnest religious convictions. The conflicts during the Stewart dynasty involved principles of infinite value both in religion and politics—principles entering into the very life of the church and state. The points raised by the nation in that grand debate were whether, as Christians, they should be free to follow the dictates of conscience, or be bound to worship God in a form prescribed by human authorities; whether as citizens they should be governed by law, or the arbitrary will of the prince. Now it never should be forgotten that while civil rights were at stake, they did not originate the contest. Religion was the occasion of it. It was a struggle to gain exemption from prescribed

forms of divine worship which aroused and quickened inquiry respecting political rights. The Puritans were the first men who unfurled the banner of freedom, and they never deserted it. Arbitrary power they always detested—the supremacy of law they always asserted. But grievances of conscience are widely different from grievances affecting the mere citizen. No one can be really sensible of the former without considerable share of religious knowledge, and an earnest conviction of its importance. The men whom Elizabeth and the Stewarts fancied they could bend and mold at will, were divinely instructed in the true nature and sublime objects of religion. In their view it was a thing of infinite moment, involving transactions between their own souls and the eternal God of awful solemnity. They felt that they had souls to be saved or lost; the fear of him who held their everlasting destinies in his hands excluded all other fear; so that, like the early heralds of the cross, they could give the calm but bold challenge to the haughtiest monarchs, ‘whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.’ * We have adverted to the character of the men and the times, simply to show that no man is completely fitted to tell their story who is a stranger to the power of godliness.”—*Princeton Review*, January, 1850, pp. 104-6.

Another difficulty in getting just views of these people before the minds of many, lies in the fact that the friends of the English hierarchy, and of Episcopacy in general, have not been able to defend and propagate their views of church government, discipline, and worship, without speaking unfavorably of the Puritans. Ever since the reign of Elizabeth, Episcopacy has been the natural adversary of Puritanism, and where it has molded and shaped men’s notions of it, these have been made unfavorable. There is a natural antagonism between the two. The one can not be written up without the other being written down in public favor. The one can not be shown to be scriptural, without the other being necessarily shown to be unscriptural. And those who take their notions of Puritanism from the representations of those who are the devoted friends of Episcopacy, must think unfavorably of the former. The principles upon which Episcopacy rests its claims, can not be defended without necessarily assailing the principles of the Puritans. And from Mr. Hall’s showing, in his Review of Dr. Coit, Episcopal writers have been as sadly wanting in some essential qualifications to tell the story of the Puritans, as those who were either “cold-blooded infidels,”

“or those who were destitute of a good degree of religious knowledge, and of clear and earnest religious convictions.”

“On reading the work,” he says, “What do I find? A manful discussion of the great principles for which the Puritans contended? A denial of the persecutions inflicted upon them by the government and the Church of England? A vindication of the principles on which the Church of England claimed the right to persecute, *i. e.*, to make canons for the use of ceremonies and to impose the same by law? Nothing like it. He wanders over the whole history, as if utterly unconscious that any principles are at stake. He roams over those most stirring times of the whole range of English history, all unconscious of the great events transpiring around him. He is unable to comprehend the tremendous results depending—of freedom or despotism—of truth or superstition—of light or darkness—to the English nation and through them to so large a portion of the family of man. He can not see what made those times stormy—he can not comprehend what had wakened up so many minds to such prodigious efforts of genius, and what aroused them to such dauntless courage and self-sacrificing endurance. He goes through the field ‘mousing’ after the faults and follies, or inconsistencies of the great actors ‘in those events, and he can see nothing else.’”

Mr. Coit's inability to “tell the story of the Puritans” may have come either of the principles of ecclesiastical polity to which he was warmly attached—or of his being in himself “frivolous and ill-natured”—or of both. But there can be no mistake as to the spirit with which he “tried to say unwelcome truths” of the Puritans. It was clearly the spirit which brought him into full sympathy with their long standing adversaries, and which would not only maintain all that Hooker ever wrote in defense of “the Church's power to make and impose ceremonies and require their use by law, but would also “justify the queen, her bishops, and her high commission,” in all the severities which they inflicted upon such as scrupled obedience to such things.

But whether “cold-hearted infidels” write, or learned and attractive authors who are “wanting in” “true and earnest religious convictions,” or men who are the natural and immemorial adversaries of the Puritans—it is much to be remarked and lamented—that we have just fallen upon a time when many most willingly and gladly take their impressions of this

people mainly from the evil that is said of them. Latterly, many in the United States have assumed as true all the evil things that either infidel historian, godless and graceless novelist, or churchman, writing "at the special request of several bishops, and many of the clergy, made, not for the first, nor the twentieth time," has put upon record. For some cause it has lately become, in certain quarters, an exceedingly popular thing to abuse the Puritans and speak in abhorrence of both their principles and their characters—and all who still cherish any reverence and love for them. Of late their very name has become a stench in the nostrils of many professed Christians. Is it represented that the Puritans in the seventeenth century "were rebels, traitors, enemies, to God and to their King, ignorant, turbulent, seditious, unconformable to law, and revilers of both church and state?" Many Protestants in the United States, professing Christ, now gladly accept the representation as true. Is it charged that the controlling motive of the Puritans, in emigrating from England to North America, was "disappointed ambition at home?" Many professed Christians believe the charge. Or do others state that the motive of the Puritans, in coming to New England, was "mainly mercenary," and with a view to "engage in the cod-fish speculation?" Many professed Christians willingly indorse the statement. Or is it insisted that the Pilgrims, "who first settled New England, and whose posterity now people the Northern States of the Union, were, and still are, a race radically different from, and greatly inferior to, those who settled the Southern States; the former being the representatives and descendants of the roundheads and the latter the descendants of the English cavaliers?" There are even Presbyterian ministers and elders who love to have it so, and would have it become the cherished idea of the times; and whatever may have been the necessity and importance of examining the real character and principles of the Puritans—of "showing what these principles are worth" twenty years ago—these now exist in a twenty fold degree. For "the principles which are inseparable from religious purity and freedom" are now on trial in our country, and studied and concerted efforts are making to induce the great body of our nation to anathematize and repudiate them; and the future alone will be able to

disclose by what costs they will be maintained in their present issues. History must be made to take up their cause and speak again for them. Men of the conscience, faith, principles and struggles of the Puritans, began to appear in the persons of the apostles, who, in order to do their duty to God and men, had to engage in a serious conflict with the civil and ecclesiastical powers of their day; and found their justification in denying their authority, in the high principle that "we ought to obey God rather than men." And even public punishment, in the form of beating, instead of availing to drive them from this principle, only caused them to rejoice "that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name of Jesus Christ." It is given to the earnest and strictly conscientious people of God, not only to believe in Christ but also to suffer for his sake. They that will live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution, must come up to their places among the great multitude arrayed in garments clean and white, out of great tribulation. Yet there were ways by which most, if not all, who have suffered for Christ since the world began, might have avoided their sufferings and still preserved their Christian name. There were compromises which they might have made. There were retractions or abatements of faith possible to them, and there were considerations that they might have suffered to tone down their feelings and convictions of duty, just enough to have turned the danger of bodily sufferings and escaped the charge of fanaticism, and just enough to have preserved a pretty good name and won a reputation for liberal views in religion. But in their respective times and places, God's zealous and earnest people have not been able to avail themselves of these things, and have felt that there was nothing in the divine principles by which their duties were regulated, nor in the example of Christ to encourage them to do so; who, having loved his own, loved them unto the end, and whose example, in resisting unto blood, we are required to follow, striving against and with whom we can be glorified together only, if so be that we suffer with him. Yet names of derision have been fixed upon God's people, at once characteristic of their principles and practice, and so applied as to bring them into popular contempt. From a very early day the term Puritan has been thus used in the Church; not

only has it been made a party name, but also a name of derision; and however "plain, unassuming, harmless, industrious in both social and religious duties—condemning, by their doctrine and manners, the whole apparatus of the reigning idolatry and superstition, and placing true religion in the faith and love of Christ, and retaining a supreme regard for the divine Word"—any have been, this has not saved them from the names and terms of derision. Have any "insisted that the Church should be kept free from gross sins, and been zealous to preserve the Church in its holiness, as a society of innocent persons, who do not defile themselves with sin"—a society whose members exemplify the truth, that "whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him; and he can not sin, because he is born of God?" They were in derision called "Cathari." Under the Decian persecution many Christians fell from their steadfastness, but afterward professed repentance and applied to be admitted again to the communion of the Church. This gave rise to a question of conscience as to how they should be treated, and the clergy were divided upon the question. We confess that we can not deride the position taken by Novatian and his adherents; for piety and spirituality have always flourished in the Church in proportion to the promptness and the judicious rigor with which discipline has been administered. We may not expect all Christians to attain to such measures of grace as will insure their steadfastness to Christ under such a state of things as the Decian persecution; but surely we can find nothing to say against those who have such grace given them. And when these people professed Christ, knowing that they did so at the risk of life, and that they could not be disciples worthy of Christ unless they could hate their lives and lay them down for him; and then, being cast into the fiery furnace, heated for them seven times, and coming out without the smell of fire upon their garments; if they insisted that all others should do as they did in the day of trial—lean on God and take the consequences—we can but admire their Christian and heroic faith, and should apprehend that evil would overtake us were we to asperse them and seek to cast contempt on their principles.

Again, did any in the seventeenth century wish for a further

reformation in the Church of England than had been effected under Henry VIII. and Edward VI.; and a purer form, not of faith, but of discipline and worship, than was tolerated under Elizabeth, being aggrieved in conscience by the asserted prerogative of the crown in things spiritual, by the unscriptural offices imposed upon the Church by the civil magistrate, and by the prescriptions of the civil laws, as to forms, ceremonies, rites, and habits indispensable to the right worship of God. These, in derision, were called Puritans. And these godly men “complained of this name as being compounded of several heresies which they abhorred, and yet fixed upon them to their reproach.” “We allow (say they), not of Papists—of the family of love—of the Anabaptists nor Brownists—no; we punish all these. And yet we are christened with the odious name of Puritans; a term compounded of the heresies above mentioned, which we disclaim. The Papists pretend to be pure and immaculate. The family of love can not sin, they being deified (as they say) in God. But we groan under the burden of our sins, and confess them to God, and, at the same time, we labor to keep ourselves and our profession unblamable.” This was the original application of the name, but it soon began to be applied to any and every person who was very conscientious in keeping and doing the will of God.

If we would seek to know the Puritans, “in connection with the times in which they lived,” the circumstances under which they acted, and with the developing of those principles for which they contended and suffered, we must start with Wickliffe and his followers, who, in the midst of the darkness of the thirteenth century, were the first to maintain that the Scriptures are a perfect rule of faith, life, and manners, and ought to be read by the people; and the first to translate the New Testament into the English language; the first to deny the supremacy of Peter among the apostles, of the Pope in the church, and who maintained most of the vital points for which the Puritans were afterward distinguished. Wickliffe and his followers incurred the displeasure of the then existing powers in the church and State to the same degree and for the same reasons for which the Puritans were deprived and made to suffer imprisonment, exile, and death. His writings, together with his bones, were burned by the decree of

the Council of Constance. Up to his day the weapons of the church had been only spiritual—no very severe laws had been enacted against heretics. But when ecclesiastical censures proved weaker with the people than Wickliffe's doctrines, in spite of such censures, his followers increased, and God's truth ran and was glorified in the midst of the greatest efforts to suppress it, and the killing of God's servants proved to be an especial means of swelling their numbers; the decree was issued by the Council of Lateran—first in the case of the Wickliffites—that all heretics should be delivered over to the civil magistrate to be burned. Upon suspicion of such heresy as Wickliffe was deemed guilty of by the ruling powers of both church and state, men were called upon to purge themselves of it, and upon refusing, this decree was rigorously executed upon them. Upon suspicion of disbelieving the doctrine of transubstantiation—the infallibility of the Pope—that the Church of Rome was the head of all other churches, or the supremacy of Peter over the other apostles; or upon the suspicion of their believing “that the Scriptures were a perfect rule of faith, and ought to be read by the people—that in ministerial orders the Scriptures sanction only two—Presbyters and Deacons; that all human traditions are superfluous and sinful; that the ministers of Christ must teach only the laws of Christ; that mystical and significant ceremonies in religious worship are unlawful; and that to restrain men to a prescribed form of prayer is contrary to the liberty granted them by God;” men were liable to be publicly burned to death by order of the civil magistrate. So that we can not, on the score of character and principles, make a distinction between the Wickliffites of the fourteenth and the Puritans of the seventeenth century. We can not admire and reverence the one, and at the same time give good reasons for repudiating and contemning the other. Such was the state of things when Henry VIII. came to the throne. Some time after the reformation had dawned upon the church, Henry quarreled with the Pope, excluded him from the headship of the church in his dominions, and invested himself with the infallibility of the Pope, and held the consciences and faith of his subjects at his disposal, and visited with death all who refused to swear that he was King and Head of the Church. He fostered and perpet-

uated the doctrines, superstitions, intolerance, and cruelties of Popery. So that, while the nation gained much on the score of independence, the people of God gained but little on the score of Christian liberty, by the change from Pope to King as head of the Church. Up to the date of his quarrel with the Pope, Henry vigorously opposed the Reformation. But even after espousing it, for some time he sternly prohibited the reading and the circulation of the Scriptures, and such as were desirous of a thorough reformation, and attached to the doctrines of the Evangelical Reformers—were treated as heretics. Tyndal and others fled into foreign lands from persecution, and while in exile prepared a translation of the New Testament; and just at the juncture when Henry had changed his mind and for the first time given permission for the reading and circulation of the word of God, Tyndal had the New Testament all ready—corrected, translated, and printed. But it was circulated in the face of great difficulties. “The Bishops condemned it as full of errors—used severity against all who read it, and complained to the King against it in such terms as induced him to call it in. And over the subject of the right of the people to the Scriptures, parties were formed and the struggle commenced, which widened and drew into it all questions involved in the religious rights of the people of God, in after generations. The men who, under Henry VIII., took ground in favor of the free circulation of the word of God, and the unrestrained reading of it, and contended against the position of such as would deny the common people the word of God, on the ground that its general reading would “lay the foundation for innumerable heresies,” were the men who had caught the spirit of Wickliffe, and embraced his evangelical views of the Gospel, and of the prevailing Popish errors and corruptions in religion, and were the men who led the party of thorough and Evangelical Reformers under Edward VI., and whose spirit descended and reappeared in the Puritans under Elizabeth. The men who labored and prayed and suffered, in order to bring about a thorough reformation of religion under the several reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth, were men of the same religious principles—the same faith, the same love of the pure word of God, the same views as to the proper

manner of worshiping God and of governing the Church. But the efforts made to withhold and suppress the word of God in Henry's day were special means under providence of bringing it into notice, and of causing the people to seek for it and eagerly read it, and bringing about a conflict between Scripture, truth, and Popish doctrines. "The people began to seriously inquire, Can men be saved by the use of holy water, absolution, extreme unction, and the eucharist, or must holy principles, deep repentance, and living faith, renew and transform the soul? And so earnest was the conflict that the King forbade all preaching, till he as head of the Church could set forth the scheme of doctrine in which all should agree." And he did set forth a scheme of doctrine for uniform faith, by mixing up, in the form of the Bishop's book, something of what both sides believed. He made the Scriptures and the ancient creeds the standards of faith, without the traditions of the Church and the decrees of the Pope. But the ceremonies, rites, and superstitions of worship were left almost untouched. It is said that "the alterations which he made in the rites of the Church were so slight that there was no need of reprinting the missal." He kept his strong hand upon the work of reformation within his dominions, and did not suffer it to proceed upon the principles of the right of private judgment and the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith—but limited it to his own ideas and conceptions, and such as did not submit to his judgments he pursued as hereties—precisely the ground that Queen Elizabeth took, and the course she pursued in the exercise of her prerogative in matters spiritual. So much to the grievance of the Puritans of her day. But let it be marked that there were men, in even Henry's day, who did not consent to his high claims as head of the Church, and who did not submit their consciences to his judgments in spiritual things, and who did, earnestly and in the face of great difficulties, dangers, and sufferings, pray and labor to have a more thorough reformation of religion made in his dominions, being men of same character, same principles, same aims, and occupying relatively the same position towards the civil and spiritual powers of their times, as the Puritans in theirs.

When Edward VI. came to the throne, "much was done in

removing superstitions and ceremonies. The Service Book, or Liturgy, was put out, reforming the officers of the Church, which, Hall says, "was gotten up under the general aim of pleasing both Papists and Reformers, taking out of the Papish Liturgy only so much as the Papists would stand to have taken out; and putting in only so much of the Scriptures as was the least that would satisfy the Protestants. Out of the Romish missals of Sarum, York, Hereford, and Bangor (for popery had never required a uniform liturgy), they compiled the morning and the evening service almost in the same form as it stands at present." This was put out with a view to harmonize the sentiments and worship of the reforming clergy and the Papists, between whom a very serious and radical conflict sprang up as soon as Edward's liberal reign began. The reforming clergy assailed images, holy water, consecrated candles, justification by sacraments, masses, absolutions, and ceremonials, while the Papists defended them. Such acts were passed by Parliament as amounted to a total change of the established religion, but these were in advance of light among the people. The great body of the priests and people had not yet understood the truth, and were not ripe for these external changes. But the conflict of views between the reforming clergy and the Papists waxed warmer and warmer, and their debate of words began to reach the crisis of violence; and the King interposed and required these contentions to cease, and signified his intention of having one uniform order throughout the realm, and till that order could be set forth, all manner of persons were forbidden to preach save by special license. The King issued his Service Book, prescribing one uniform order, and by act of parliament all divine offices were required to be performed according to it under pain of severe penalties. The people were unwilling to give up their ancient rituals; a liturgy was therefore adopted that went in the direction of the Reformation only as far as the times allowed; and those who got it up as the best that the state of the times would permit, were not satisfied with their own work, but desired to have carried the work of reforming the service of the Church much further. But owing to the want of scripture knowledge among the masses of the people, and the very limited extent to which genuine

reformation had been carried among them, all that King Edward and his reforming clergy could do, was to "draw up their Liturgy from Popish originals," and leave the rituals and vestments retaining as much of the shape, fashion, and savor of Popery as would render them not idolatrous, with the hope of further amendments when the times would allow them.

Mary next came into power, and being a zealous Papist, she at once restored the papal religion, the Pope to the headship of the Church, and tried to undo all that had been done in reformation of religion under Henry and Edward, and put to death many leading Protestants; and to escape her fiery and bloody hands, many others fled to other lands. John Rogers had the distinguished honor of being the Lord's first martyr under her hands. Profoundly learned, enlightened in the true doctrine of the Gospel, and receiving meekly the truth as it is in Jesus, he was among the first under Henry to cast off the idolatry of Rome, and spend his energies in aiding the work of translating the word of God into the English language, and in preaching the Gospel in its simplicity and power. For these things, after suffering imprisonment and passing through three different trials before the zealous friends of popery, and always defending himself manfully, and while in his trials, many things "were put upon him to aggravate his sufferings, always preserving remarkable equanimity of mind, and finally yielding up his testimony with great joy." This is the man whose memory has always been precious to the hearts of God's people in all countries, and whose name, character, and piety the people of New England, a few years ago, took special care to honor. Forty years ago it was remarkable how uniformly the children throughout the United States first began to learn their A, B, C, in the New England Primer, presenting upon its front page John Rogers chained to a stake in the midst of flames of fire kept stirred up by Mary's executioners, his wife and children standing and weeping around him; and concluding with the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly.

Elizabeth succeeded to the throne, and was a Protestant. The exiles hastened home, and those Protestants who had hid themselves began to appear. But Elizabeth was not Protestant enough to risk the loss of her crown for the sake of giving

her people, at once, the Gospel in its purity. She used carnal policy in her manner of carrying on the Reformation. While she felt that it was important to uphold the Reformation, she also felt that it was important to conciliate her papal subjects, and consequently the public religion continued, for a time, in the same posture in which she found it; the popish priests kept their livings and went on celebrating mass; none of the Protestant clergy who had been ejected in the reign of Mary were restored; and orders were given against all innovations in religion without public authority. The acts of Henry and Edward were revived, restoring to the crown supremacy in the Church. These acts had been passed by Parliament, investing the crown with all jurisdiction in church and state, and giving to the prince authority to make laws, ceremonies, and constitutions, and without him no such laws, ceremonies, etc., could be of force. In Henry's time, "the Parliament had given to the king the prerogatives of infallibility, and bound themselves and the kingdom to receive upon trust, without question or examination, whatever dogmas or ceremonies the king and his prelates should be pleased to establish; and it was left to the civil courts to interfere with the ecclesiastical whenever it became a question what ecclesiastical requisitions were contrary to the laws and statutes of the realm." The leading Protestants, who had returned from exile, before leaving the continent, had been "pressed by the Reformers there to act with zeal and courage, and take care in the first beginnings to have all things settled upon sure and sound foundations; and had come home under strong convictions that it was their duty to do so, and to make a bold stand for a thorough reformation." They immediately joined issue with these acts of Parliament and this supreme power of the crown in ecclesiastical matters. They objected to the absurdity of a lay person, and that, too, a woman, as in the present case, being the head of a spiritual body. The Queen explained that she did not, as head of the Church, pretend to be a spiritual person; nor intend to "exercise any ecclesiastical function in her own person; nor challenge authority to minister divine service in the Church; and that all that was intended in her claims to supremacy was that, under God, she had the sovereignty and rule over all persons born in her realms, either

ecclesiastical or temporal, so as no foreign power had, or ought to have, authority over them." The Protestants were willing to die in order to maintain her sovereignty thus far; but they did not believe that the government of the Church was monarchical, nor that any single person, layman or ecclesiastic, ought to assume the title of supreme head of the Church on earth. In the obvious sense of these acts of Parliament, and in pressing this idea they soon found that the Queen did not stand by her own explication, and that she did claim to be supreme head of the Church to the extent of the papal idea; and by the act of uniformity which she soon caused to be passed, and the rigor with which that act was carried out under her superintendence and direction, she made them *feel* her supremacy. They soon found that she claimed to be supreme in matters of faith, and to have the power to say what was agreeable to the word of God, or repugnant to it; to hold the keys of discipline; to be the ultimate judge in matters spiritual; to have power to ordain such ceremonies or rites as she might deem best; to nominate bishops and control their election, and suspend them from office at her pleasure; that no ecclesiastical court or synod could assemble but by a writ from her, and when assembled, do any business but such as she might lay before it, and that its acts could be of no force without her sanction. And she did, with a resolute will, exercise all these powers; resist all attempts of Parliament to restrain her in them, and exerted her whole strength in keeping the Reformation within such limits as were strictly consistent with these high claims. And during her reign the Reformation could not be carried beyond what was in keeping with them. She published fifty-three articles specifying wherein, and to what extent, the Reformation should go, and commanding her subjects to reform their religion so far and no farther; and her commands were carried out by her commissions of visitation and high courts of commission to the letter. She fixed by law the order of lessons to be read in divine service throughout the year, and allowed no discretion to ministers and people as to what portion of God's word would be most for edification at particular times. She went to the full length of her asserted prerogative in specifying minutely how ministers of the Gospel should be dressed while

officiating, and in appointing and regulating rites and ceremonies; and the Parliament even "empowered her to ordain and publish such farther ceremonies and rites as may be for the advancement of God's glory, and edifying his Church and the reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments." But she exercised her prerogative in all these things much to the grievance of the consciences of the stricter Protestants, and much in favor of her papal subjects. She caused King Edward's Liturgy to be reviewed, and all passages offensive to the Pope to be stricken out, and made such changes in it as tended to conciliate the Papists, restoring the practice of kneeling at the sacrament in adoration of the corporeal presence—restoring the Romish festivals and the Popish habits. When her real mind was understood, it was ascertained that she thought her brother had carried the Reformation too far, and she was unwilling to go to the same length to which he had gone. In King Edward's Liturgy all the Popish garments had been laid aside except the surplice; but she ordered the full Popish habit to be used, and being thus changed, the Liturgy was by Parliament given the force of law, and acts were passed requiring all the people to conform their worship to it (June 24, 1559).

At this time the Protestants were all of one faith. They agreed in doctrines, but differed widely as to church government, discipline, and ceremonies. Some heartily conceded to the Queen all the authority in the Church which she claimed, and the acts of Parliament gave her. These were styled the Court Reformers. But the stricter Protestants, who began now to be styled in derision of their conscience and evangelical views of divine things, *Puritans*, did not believe that the crown ought to have such powers in the Church, and held that such powers were not agreeable to the Scriptures, nor to the natural rights of mankind. And we can not follow them in all the conflicts in which they engaged for the purpose of maintaining the honor and purity of Christ's laws and worship, and mark the spirit that inspired them, and feel the power of their arguments against the views of their adversaries and in support of their own, without feeling that the spirit of glory and of God did rest upon them, and that the Holy Ghost did, in a certain sense, speak in them. "There were many things

which caused them to be dissatisfied with the hierarchy, and which they labored throughout the reign of Elizabeth to have removed." We need notice but a few of these. And first of all was the asserted prerogative of the crown in matters spiritual. They contended that "the powers of the civil magistrate relate chiefly to the civil welfare of his subjects, and the protection of them in the enjoyment of their civil and religious rights; and that there is no passage in the New Testament which gives him a commission to be lord over the consciences of his subjects, or to have dominion over their faith. Also, that such power is not agreeable to reason, because religion ought to be the effect of a free and deliberate choice. They asked: Why must we believe as the King believes, any more than as the Pope believes? Also, that it was unreasonable that the religion of a whole nation should be at the disposal of a single lay person; and that if the civil magistrate be the sole lawgiver of the Church, he may ordain at pleasure, dispense with scriptural laws, and enjoin such as are unscriptural, and lawfully do what Mary did when she restored the papacy, and bind the consciences of her subjects to be good Papists, or errorists of any class; and to the last, and without fear of the certainty of great sufferings as the consequence, they insisted and maintained that the spiritual authority of the Church is invested in her spiritual officers. And surely Presbyterians in the United States ought to be the last of men to think slightly of them for holding such views on this point.

Again, the Court Reformers held the Scriptures to be a perfect rule of faith, but not a perfect standard of church government and discipline; and that the Saviour and his apostles left it to the discretion of the civil magistrate to accommodate the government of the Church to the policy of the State. But the Puritans held the Scriptures to be a standard of government and discipline, as well as of doctrine, and that nothing should be imposed as necessary but what was expressly contained in, or derived from, them by necessary consequence; and that if things necessary for the government of the Church could not be deduced from the Scriptures, the discretionary power was not vested in the civil magistrate, but in the spiritual officers of the Church. The Court Reformers maintain

that the practice of the primitive church, for the first four or five centuries, was a proper standard of church government and discipline, and, in some respects, better than that of the apostles, which was accommodated to the infant state of the church, whereas this was suited to the grandeur of a national establishment.

But the Puritans were for keeping close to the word of God, in the main principles of church government, and for admitting no church officer, nor ordinances, but such as are appointed therein. They held that the form of government ordained by the apostles was aristocratical, according to the constitution of the Jewish Sanhedrim, and was designed for a pattern to the churches, not to be departed from in any of its main principles; and, therefore, they paid no regard to the customs of early centuries, any further than they corresponded with the Scriptures.

Again the Court Reformers held that things indifferent, in their own nature—neither commanded nor forbidden in the Scriptures—as ceremonies, rites, habits, might be settled, determined, and made necessary by the command of the civil magistrate; and that, in such cases, it was the indispensable duty of subjects to observe them. They thought that ceremonies and habits might be used or not, in the Church; and that if any, those of Rome were to be preferred, because the people were accustomed to them.

But the Puritans insisted that those things which Christ has left indifferent, ought not to be made necessary by human laws, but that we are to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free; and that such rites, ceremonies, and habits as the Queen had ordained and required to be observed as necessary parts of worship were, in point of fact, not indifferent, but that there were many serious considerations which showed that they were unlawful and to be rejected by God's people. They insisted that these things—and particularly the habits—had been abused to idolatry and superstition, and manifestly tended to lead men back to Popery and superstition. The wearing of Popish garments was a great difficulty with the Puritans. They admitted that it was a very small thing whether a minister should dress himself in a particular habit; but they felt that it was not a small matter for

the civil law to make it a great sin if he did not. But in this case, the peculiar and ancient uniform of Popery—the very livery of its servants—was required to be worn by Protestants. They could not see the wisdom of casting away the Pope, yet holding on to his garments as holy relics, and this when these were regarded by the masses of the people as the badges of the Popish faith; also as being consecrated, and, therefore, possessing a mysterious virtue—like holy water—which mystic virtue imparted a sacredness and validity to the acts of the priests who wore them, and that without them the priest could not be sure that the necessary virtue flowed from his acts to make them valid. Knowing that the people held these habits in this estimation, the Puritans believed that the use of them would be to symbolize with anti-Christ—to mislead the people, and give sanction to this false view of their mystic virtue; and therefore they could not deem their use a matter of indifference, and wished to cast them away, with everything pertaining to Pope and Popery. Also, they found no authority for their use in the Scriptures; also, they felt it was unbecoming in a minister of Christ to minister in his name rigged out in the uniform and badges of anti-Christ; and that such habits were inconsistent with the simplicity of the Christian religion; and the Queen, in requiring them to wear these habits, was virtually guilty of usurping the powers of Christ in the Church, who is its sole lawgiver, and has enjoined all things necessary to be observed to the end of the world; and yet has nowhere enjoined habits—and particularly the habits of the man of sin—but has indulged a liberty to his followers, which they are as much bound to maintain as to observe anything which he has commanded. If the Queen may make these things necessary in the service of God which the Scriptures do not make necessary, she may dress up religion as her caprice may suggest, and, acknowledging no limits to her discretion, instead of one ceremony, load it with a hundred. And in addition to the conclusiveness and cogency of their arguments in behalf of what their consciences were pleading for, the Puritans felt all the more deeply on this subject because they had evidence that the Queen was using her power over the Church mainly to gain carnal and worldly ends, and was doing what she did in the way of reformation more from a

desire to secure the quiet and conformity of her papal subjects, than to promote the purity of religion, and bring it back to a pure Scripture standard. They felt that the Queen's exercise of power in these things was purely arbitrary, and, therefore, to be resisted by the servants of God, on the ground that we ought to obey God rather than men. They began to see and feel that subjects owe no obedience where kings and princes have no right to command; and that God himself not only allows, but requires in subjects disobedience to kings, when the edicts of kings contravene the word of God. And John Knox began to maintain the position "that if kings refuse to reform religion, inferior magistrates and the people, being instructed in the truth by their preacher, may lawfully reform within their own bounds, themselves." There were many other points of disagreement between the Court Reformers and the stricter Protestants. But these are sufficient to indicate the nature of them all, and the importance of the principles for which the Puritans were contending. In the above-mentioned things we see what it was that aroused their minds and consciences, and what caused to spring up in that day the grand debate which drew after it, and into it, the great questions of the limits of civil and ecclesiastical power, and of religious freedom—a debate in which the Court Reformers were so fairly, yet so manifestly beaten in the argument. But when vanquished in the argument, the Queen and her Reformers had other resources upon which to fall back—power was on their side; and, therefore, the Reformation was settled upon the principles of the Court party, and they carried out their views and measures with decision of purpose and great rigor of execution—going even beyond the authority of the laws enacted in their favor, and inflicting censures, fines, imprisonments, and inquisitorial oaths, to such degree as wrung the heart of the nation in pain and affliction, and wore out the patience of the saints of the Most High.

When Scripture argument failed to influence the Queen and her Court party, the Puritans petitioned for indulgence—protesting loyalty to the Queen and the civil laws—but asking not to be required, upon pain of civil penalties, to observe in the worship of God things which, in their candid view, were sinful. But their petition was rejected; and the Queen and

Court Reformers took the ground that the Puritans should not be allowed to think for themselves as to matters of the Queen's prerogative, and the rites and ceremonies which she had ordained; also, they required the Puritans to confess under oath that her claims of spiritual power, and everything in the prayer-book, and her injunctions, were agreeable to the word of God, and such as refused to make the confession were deprived of place and license, and thrown into prison. These rigors caused ministers and people to forsake their parish churches, and meet in private places for God's worship. The Queen attempted to compel their attendance at the parish churches, by fines and imprisonments. But they denied the authority of the civil power to command in such things, and insisted that a superior regard was due to the word of God above what was due to the will of the Queen in these things. Parliament interposed, and made efforts to give relief to the Puritans by law. This alarmed the Bishops and offended the Queen, and caused her to strain her prerogative and strike a blow at the freedom of Parliament. "Many of its members were aroused by her course—had a brave spirit of liberty awakened in them, and many free speeches were made." But the Queen triumphed—carried things her way—and sent these speakers to the Tower. Though the hearty sympathies of the House of Commons was with the Puritans, the Queen and Court party held the power through the upper House, and prevented legislation contrary to their views, and made the Puritans suffer the full extremity of the legal penalties for non-conformity. But these severities against men of pious and holy lives raised the compassion of the great mass of the common people, and brought them over to the interests of these persecuted men, and led them to resort to their prisons, and, standing in the streets, hear them preach the Gospel through prison bolts and bars, and many people of rank encouraged them in it. The more stringently the Queen had the penalties of non-conformity inflicted, the more did the people of all ranks sympathize with them and espouse their cause, until the Queen was made to realize that the hearts of her subjects were becoming alienated from her. And, though much chagrined and mortified over this fact, she relaxed nothing and conceded nothing to her Puritan subjects, and asserted

and exercised all her high powers in the Church to the last. She was nothing deterred nor diverted from her purpose to keep the Church in subserviency to her will and pleasure, by the way the Lord oftentimes and so manifestly turned her hands against herself, and made her stringent measures for enforcing conformity signally efficacious in defeating her aim, and in increasing the numbers and influence of the party whom she was laboring to extinguish. Though her efforts to coerce conformity did but have the effect to drive the Puritans to the establishing of separate communions, and to extend prophesyings over the country, and increase Scriptural knowledge among the people, and establish private presbyteries and assemblies for the recovering of the discipline of the Church to a more primitive standard, she never swerved from her purpose, and in the face of the great and decided revolution which was rapidly progressing in the knowledge and sentiments of her people, "she refused to permit prophesyings and assemblies for reading the Scriptures, and all things else tending to invite free inquiry after truth—being of opinion that knowledge and learning in the laity would only endanger their peaceable submission to her absolute will and pleasure.

(*To be Continued.*)



ART. VI.—*The True Mission of the Church.**

GENTLEMEN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND BRETHREN OF
THE SYNOD:

ON entering, in this formal manner, upon the duties of the office to which I have been appointed, under the sanctions of the writing which I have subscribed in your presence, I may

* This article is an inaugural address, delivered in Paris, Kentucky, May 2, 1863, before the Synod of Kentucky and the Board of Directors of Danville Theological Seminary, on the induction of the author into the office of Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology in that institution.

be allowed to say that this is one of the most solemn moments of my life. To be called to take part in instructing the rising ministry of the Gospel, to be called to this work by the supreme judicatory of the Church, and to assume the obligations which such a position imposes at a time when the overturnings among the kingdoms of the earth betoken the near approach of the Son of Man with power and great glory, serve to invest the occasion on which we are assembled with peculiar interest to me; and in all this I doubt not I but share the sympathies of this venerable synod, in the bosom of which the General Assembly has established one of the seminaries of the Church, for whose prosperity your prayers, and labors, and contributions have been so well and so freely bestowed.

The department of instruction assigned to me in this seminary—that of Church Government and Pastoral Theology—comprehends what more immediately enters into the current experience and duties of the Church in the actual and constant working out, in real life, of Jehovah's grand designs of mercy for men. From this stand-point it has been termed the department of Applied Theology, to which the Exegetical, the Dogmatic, and the Historical look forward, in a measure, as their end. In this view, nothing can be more important than the general subject-matter which this department embraces, nor more weighty than the responsibility which it imposes. To attempt the work of instructing those who are to become instructors of the people; in the preaching of the Gospel, both in the matter and manner of the service, and in conducting all parts of the worship of the Lord's house, so as to fulfill his gracious designs of saving, out of all people, his own chosen ones, and holding forth "this Gospel of the kingdom in all the world for a witness unto all nations;" in the pastoral watch and care of the Church, composed of imperfect, erring men, in the midst of an ungodly world, so as to preserve "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace," reaching the salutary ends of all discipline in the edification of true believers and the severance of the profane and reprobate; and in the exercise of the functions of government in all the courts of the Church, from the parochial through the presbyterial and synodical up to the general assembly of the whole body, so as to promote love and concord, and the preventing or healing of schism,

and maintain the body of Christ intact "in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God," in order "that they all may be one," and that thereby "the world may know," as Christ declares they should, that he is sent of the Father, and that his Church bears a testimony to which all men should give heed; all this is a work which no man should covet, and from which any one may justly shrink. In undertaking this work, at the call of the General Assembly, I can only cast myself upon the indulgence of my brethren and upon the grace of God.

General custom, as well as the manifest proprieties of the case, suggest that I should engage your attention with some theme connected more especially with the department committed to my care. Dr. Blair, in his elaborate work on rhetoric, when classifying the several kinds of public speaking with reference to their object, puts down "inaugural orations" in the category of those "which aim only at pleasing the hearers." But in such a service and in such a presence as this, something higher should be attempted. If my aim be not to instruct these venerable fathers and brethren—with whom, for such a purpose, we might well change places—the occasion on which we are convened may justly lead us all into regions of contemplation, and to communion upon themes which have a far nobler aim than to afford a momentary pleasure.

If the Scriptures are a revelation from God, no duties which are imposed upon men are more solemn in their execution, more glorious or awful in their results, and, at the same time, none may be discharged with a more cheerful spirit and bring a higher reward, than those which fall to the lot of the ministers of Christ. They are the gatherers, the guardians, the instructors of his blood-bought Church. And as no other society on earth, nor all mankind besides, can bear any comparison with this spiritual body for importance in the world or to the world, as doing even the generations of the ungodly unspeakable good; and as nothing else which God has made or done in all the eternity of the past, so far as revealed to us, for setting forth his glory, either among men or before the principalities and powers above, may vie with what he is unfolding through the successive ages of his Church, and will consummate in the end; so the true body of Christ, in all its

individual members, and so all the ministers of this body, and all the divinely-appointed ordinances and institutions of the Church, for carrying forward the glorious purposes of God, hold a place among men and before heaven infinitely above all other interests in which any part of his universe is concerned.

Under inspirations so lofty and soul-stirring, let us devote the passing hour to some reflections upon *the true mission of the Church.*

There is a wide field for discussion still open upon many topics which come appropriately within this department of seminary instruction, and which underlie all that belongs to it. Concerning some of the most vital of these, the faith of the Church is not yet settled. Even within our own denomination, not only among her people and her ministers, but among those whom the supreme judicatory of the common body has selected to teach in her seminaries, these differences are found to exist, and they involve matters of great moment. Among them are questions which relate to the nature and attributes of the Church; to its powers within and for itself; to its relations to the state and to the world at large; to some of its officers, with the nature and extent of their functions; and even the naked question, What is the Church? would be answered very differently by eminent men in our own communion, who have made the subjects appertaining to its solution a life-long study. These, and others of a kindred character, have entered into the elaborate discussions many years past; and, from present indications, these discussions will continue for an indefinite time to come. On this occasion, however, we choose to pass all these topics by, as better suited to the lecture-room, or to a more thorough handling than our time will admit; and we wish at present to look directly at the theme we have named, as one of interest, importance and great practical concern. It is, indeed, quite palpable to every one, that we can not justly entertain or exhibit what belongs to the true mission of the Church, without understanding its true nature, attributes, powers, offices, relations, prerogatives, and whatever else may enter into the simple question, What is the Church? But there is, for our present purpose, a sufficiently definite apprehension in the popular mind as to the

real character of that body among men, distinct from all other organizations—which we call the *Church of Christ*—to warrant our coming directly to the question of its true mission in the world. To this simple topic let us then give our present attention.

We shall not be deemed guilty of transcending the limits of truth, nor of irreverence toward God, in declaring that, so far as known to men, redemption is the grandest conception of the Deity. The establishment of such a proposition would show at once the exalted character of the mission of the Church. It calls, however, for no elaborate and formal proof, though we may barely notice some of the points involved. We assume as a postulate in revealed theology, that the glory of God is the end of all things: “For of him, and through him, and to him are all things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen.” While this is undeniable, it is nowhere asserted in the Scriptures that it is the design of the present scheme of things to secure the highest absolute glory of God. What may compass that grand problem we do not know, for God has not told us. It may be true that the highest absolute glory of God is designed, and if so, it will infallibly be reached through what is now transpiring; or this consummation may be reserved for something yet to come, not opened to our knowledge. We certainly may not conclude, without definite authority, that the resources of the Deity, in the line of the divine glory, are exhausted in what the present system of things contemplates, and therefore that this is the system above all other possible modes for reaching the highest point in the proposed end. If God is infinite in his nature, and is from eternity to eternity, our lips must be dumb as to what he can and may do, touching all things which lie beyond the line of his own specific revelations. Of this, however, we are certain, that all things belonging to the present system of the universe do actually promote the glory of God. It was from the beginning, and is now, his purpose that they should, and this purpose is infallibly secured. This is true of unconscious matter and of conscious mind; of all the physical worlds, and of all their tribes from the insect to the archangel; of holy and obedient subjects on earth and in heaven, and of the wicked among men and devils; of sin and of righteous-

ness, as attributes of character, and all the influences and fruits which result from them. In the very widest sense, all things are for the glory of God. It by no means follows that all things promote God's glory in the same way, nor in an equal degree, much less that God approves with complacency all that occurs. This would be to annihilate distinctions which are clearly announced in the Scriptures, and which also are as palpable to the human mind as anything within its knowledge. But it is, nevertheless, the prerogative of God to cause all things to promote his glory. This prerogative he does actually exercise, and the result is, therefore, infallibly secured through the present system of things, whatever may indeed be the measure of the glory which, in this manner, he has proposed to himself.

While the Scriptures thus plainly declare God's glory to be the end of all things, it must be equally clear, even to the human reason, that nothing can so highly conduce to this end as the display of his own perfections. This must be the case whatever the circumstances of the exhibition may be. If we contemplate God as existing from eternity, before the exercise of creative power, he can present to himself alone no higher glory than himself. If we behold him bringing into existence successive orders of rational creatures with the purpose of showing unto them his glory, endowed with powers adequate to appreciating it, still he can display it in no higher manner than by the unfolding before them of his own perfections. It is no doubt true, that with the same end in view he may choose another mode, and show his glory in a subordinate degree; but the highest attainable display must be in the exhibition of the characteristics of his infinite nature. And even here, the degree in which his glory will be actually displayed, will be measured by the extent of the unfoldings of his varied perfections which he may choose to make; and the degree in which this exhibition will be appreciated by his rational creatures, will depend upon their capacities and opportunities, and their proper improvement of them.

It seems, furthermore, to be perfectly clear, from the whole scope of the Scriptures, that redemption more gloriously unfolds the divine perfections than anything else known to men. And that it is the measure for the highest manifestation

of the divine perfections known even to the angels, there is much ground for believing. We are warranted, therefore, in declaring, not only so far as known to men, but probably to the highest order of created beings also, that redemption, to accomplish which on earth the church has been organized, is the grandest conception of the Deity. And, indeed, it may be—there are at least shadowings of the truth in this direction—that redemption, in its eternal purpose, subsequent development, ceaseless progress, and final consummation, is now, and is designed to be through all the cycles of a coming eternity, the scheme with which nothing shall compare, to set forth before all creatures, in the display of his boundless perfections, the very highest absolute glory of God. The place which the Scriptures give it, among all the purposes and counsels of the Godhead, appears, with much good reason, to warrant this conclusion. Hence, we are assured that, as a manifestation of God, of his attributes, character, works, and government, redemption embraces in its plan, in its objects, and in its agents, all worlds and all beings. The entire universe, with all it contains, was created and is ruled only to subserve its ends. Angels and demons are its agents. Wicked men and good men promote it. It includes the whole of providence, universal and particular. This extends to all worlds and all creatures; to all thoughts, purposes, and actions of rational beings, and to all events of the physical creation. All these God controls and directs with absolute certainty, and they are all made to contribute to the grand purpose. In the prosecution of redemption, there are exhibited characteristics of the Deity not in any other manner displayed to human, and probably not to angelic, knowledge, while those otherwise known are here made to shine forth more brightly. Mercy, grace, compassion, long-suffering, have no such display anywhere else. Though such perfections belong to God's nature as truly as any others, yet, so far as we know, they have no scope for a full and actual exhibition, except in redemption; and undoubtedly they make a far deeper impression on the higher orders of rational beings from the circumstances under which they are illustrated, and from the results which follow, than could be secured in any other way. This is evident from their irrepressible desire to look further into these deep mysteries. So,

on the other hand, those perfections which stand opposite to these, as justice and wrath, are more strikingly seen in the events which occur in the prosecution of this plan than they otherwise could be, and their true nature and real necessity as elements of government are far better understood. And what is most wonderful of all is the fact that, in the manifold wisdom of God, redemption is the only measure known wherein we see these apparently conflicting attributes working together in perfect harmony, showing God to be at the same moment infinitely merciful and infinitely just; thus baffling forever the boastings of human reason, vindicating God's ways to men, shutting the lips of gainsayers, and setting upon the Scriptures, in which these amazing unfoldings are found, the true signet of the King of kings. And we see, also, that all the fundamental elements of the divine government, running through its entire administration over any beings, are more boldly brought out in redemption than anywhere else. Law, as an element of government, stands out here in greater prominence by reason of its connection with grace. It is maintained, magnified, and made honorable by Christ, as it could not be by men or angels. Its righteousness is seen in the Redeemer's obedience more brightly, and its penalty in his death more fearfully, than the one could be seen in the fidelity, or the other in the eternal perdition, of all God's creatures. So, also, sin appears more malignant and hell-deserving in the light of the Redeemer's cross, than in all other punishments actual and possible. And there are peculiar beauties in holiness, under the Gospel economy of grace, which we may look for in vain under any mere dispensation of law.

And now, if we rise from a contemplation of these features of the divine character and administration to the actual concern in redemption, taken by the great administrator, we find that it engages the supreme interest and energies of the Godhead. It is the sum of the divine counsels from eternity, and the end of all dispensations. The Father has committed its execution to his only-begotten and well-loved Son. To accomplish it, God become incarnate—the great “mystery of Godliness!” The Father has given to the Son “all power in heaven and in earth,” and for the time has put the government of the whole universe into his hands. The Son is “God

with us;" "the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person;" "Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God." Having come in "the fullness of time," and having suffered, risen, ascended, and entered upon his dominion, all the power of his Deity, all the sympathies of his humanity, and all the resources of his vast empire, are now given to the execution of redemption. The third person in the Trinity performs a part in the great scheme, equally necessary and important. So far as God's chosen people are concerned, the Holy Spirit makes actually effective the purpose of the Father and work of the Son, by applying to them the redemption purchased by Christ. By his regenerating grace he brings each one to take his true position in the redeemed family of God; and there, through the means of his sanctifying grace, they are all "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." Beyond this, through the force of his divine truth, the Holy Spirit "reproves the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment."

It thus plainly appears how it is that redemption so highly displays the divine glory. It embraces all worlds, beings, counsels, works, and providences, from eternity to eternity. It exhibits God in the fullness of his attributes and administration over all. It supremely engages all the persons of the Godhead in its plans and their execution. And in each and all these features, it stands forth in matchless grandeur, infinitely above all else we know of a wonder-working God!

At this point, we see the direct bearing of the whole upon the mission of the Church. The plan of redemption is wrought out before the eyes of a wondering universe upon our earth and among our race. Of the two orders of fallen beings, men only are redeemed. The Son of God took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham. In this nature, he taught, obeyed, wrought his mighty works, and atoned for sin. In this nature, he arose, ascended, and reigns. In this nature, he will come the second time without sin unto salvation. In this nature, he will judge the world. All that Christ did upon earth and is doing in heaven, all that the Father's counsels contemplated, and all that the Spirit's work accomplishes, is directly for man. He alone, as a sinner, is redeemed. Other orders of beings are deeply interested, and may be in some way directly blessed by

redemption, but man is the sole recipient of saving grace. It is thus upon this earth and among the race of Adam that this grandest of divine conceptions for the display of the divine glory has its chief accomplishment. And it is just here that we behold the dignity, the importance, and the true design, of the Church. It is to carry out, by and through the Church, this great scheme of grace, for the illustration of Jehovah's glory, that the Church has been gathered and organized. Its true and specific mission, therefore, in due subordination to the divine purpose which controls the whole, is to gather the Lord's elect out of all nations from age to age, to perfect the body of Christ, and to hold forth before all people the truth and ordinances of God as a living testimony to his condescension to the children of men, and for a swift witness against all the workers of iniquity. The Church is thus the divinely-appointed instructor of all people in the entire revealed will of God. It must declare "all the counsel of God," unfolding and enforcing every duty arising out of every position filled by men, and reaching to every relationship of life; and it must delineate and denounce all infractions of the divine law, and all neglect or frustration of the Gospel of grace; the sole object in all being to promote the glory of God, both through the salvation of all who hear the Church, and through the condemnation of all who turn a deaf ear to her voice.

That such is the mission of the Church is not more clearly revealed than is the real character of the body itself, and the definite manner in which it is to execute its mission. God has authoritatively determined and declared the whole. He has plainly drawn the portraiture of the Church, as a divine organization, under One Glorious Head, the Lord Jesus Christ; defined the characteristics of its members, and set forth their duties, privileges, trials, and rewards; declared the number, name, qualifications, and functions of its officers, and how the body shall be perpetuated and extended from age to age; instituted its ordinances, for its own edification and for the instruction and warning of the world without: and directed the Church in its whole duty, as an organized body, respecting the measures through which it is to fulfill its mission among men, in the constant enlargement of its own spiritual boundaries, and in carrying the Gospel in the true missionary

spirit of Christ and his apostles to all the tribes of the earth. What God has thus revealed touching all these points, the Church must fulfill. Beyond this she has no mission, for beyond this she has no authority. Whatever may be essential in the circumstances of her own condition or in the state of the world, to enable her to exercise the specific grant of her power, or to discharge the full measure of her duty within the stipulations of her authority, is, from the necessities of the case, left to her wisdom and discretion, seeking counsel of God. Beyond this, and even within this, she is shut up to the directions of his revealed will.

It is another clear principle of revelation, that the Church of Christ is the sole organization among mankind for effecting the high purpose of illustrating, in this peculiar manner, the glory of God. It is to accomplish its mission, efficiently yet solely, under grace, through the specific means of God's appointment. The great power in its hands is revealed truth. Its chief manner of employing it is by the ministry of reconciliation, in the preaching of the Word, and through the sacraments and services of the Lord's house. As the ministry is a chief instrumentality, in order to meet the ever-increasing wants of the Church as she enlarges her boundaries, and to meet the demands of a perishing world, a special work of the Church, than which there is none of higher importance and necessity, is the training up of a ministry. Without this, no purpose of the Church's existence can be secured. Seal the lips of the ministry, annihilate the order, and the sanctuary would be closed, the Sabbath soon forgotten, the people go untaught, and the Church and the world would perish together. Christ's presence in the Church, through all its ordinances, is a real and constant presence, by his Spirit. Without it these ordinances are vain; with it they are life and power. But in the economy of grace which God in wisdom has established, the living ministry is an essential and chief element in the realization of this power. Without it, Christ's presence would not be given any more than without the truth, or the sacraments, or ordinary worship. And beyond all this—such is man—Christ's presence could not be made effectual without the living teacher, but upon a change either of the nature of man, or of the whole Gospel economy.

It is not more true that "we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us," than it is that this feature of the plan of grace is essential as a bond of sympathy between the glorified and unseen Saviour and his people. Hence the absolute necessity of the ministry. Now, is it merely a living ministry that is demanded, but a ministry of flesh and blood, a ministry in the body, a ministry of the same race. The ministry of angels would not answer the end. It must be a ministry of man, as it is a ministry to man and for man. This is a prime and radical element of this economy. And while, on the one hand, the Church may here behold one of the richest gifts of her inheritance from her ascended Lord, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ;" so, on the other hand, the Church may here learn one of the plainest and most important of the duties which her divine Head has imposed upon her. It is to train up and send forth this ministry of reconciliation. This involves parental consecration of children to this work; their proper education; the endowment and support of institutions for the professional training of the ministry; funds for the maintenance of candidates who may need aid; and all else which the wisdom of the Church, developed from age to age, under the providence of God, shows to be necessary. We are well assured, from Scripture, from the experience of the Church, from her whole history, and from her present necessities, that those who are blessed with this world's goods, be it little or much, can not do a better service for the Lord with their worldly substance, than to bestow it upon institutions for a wise training of the Gospel ministry; and their liberality in this regard should be proportioned to the greatness of the work which the Church has to do, under the pressing calls of her many waste places, and the demands of the world at home and abroad.

If the position we have taken be correct, that so far as man's knowledge extends, redemption is the grandest conception of the Deity, it is evident that the mission of the Church is the noblest which can engage any beings. The truth it

teaches eclipses all other knowledge; its sacraments surpass all other memorials; its worship engages higher faculties and aspirations than any other possessed by men; its objects contemplate infinitely more, even for humanity alone, for this world as well as the next, than the highest or even all schemes of benevolence and philanthropy; it carries with all its measures a divine power which touches the springs of moral being, and directs all the after-life of man; its destiny is to ameliorate, and finally to remove, all the evils of this world, and make it a paradise of God; its people are the elect of God, the hidden ones, the chosen from eternity, the princes of the race, the priests of God, the Lord's peculiar treasure; the ultimate aim and end of all its labors, its sacrifices, and its sufferings, is to secure the eternal redemption of all the Lord's people, and contribute to the highest glory of the Godhead! What a mission, what a work, what a destiny, what an honor, what a glory, has the Lord placed before his Church!

The ministry, to whom is committed the duty of leading in this career of the Church, is, by virtue of the considerations just mentioned, the most honored and responsible body among men. We say this, not in self-adulation of our order, but with a due sense of what God has declared, and in the spirit of the apostle who said, "I magnify mine office." If, then, the mission of the Church is here rightly viewed, how great must be the obligations which rest upon the ministry, and how pressing the need of its increase, that it may keep pace with the demands of the Church and the world. With what earnest inquiry as to the cause and remedy, should the fact be pondered, which was stated before our last General Assembly, in the report upon the Board of Education, that "there has been an actual decrease of the ministry as compared with the membership of our church, of at least five per centum within the last ten years." According to this, the ministry has not even kept pace with the Church, to say nothing of the increasing wants of our country from a rapid increase of population, and the still greater demands of the world at large; and this, too, covering a period within which there have been more marked and general outpourings of the Spirit upon the churches than during any given period of equal length in our church's history. And how shall this be explained?

Have the allurements of wealth and honor from the wonderful prosperity of our country been so great that parents have withheld their sons from the Lord's work, and that the vast body of our pious young men have too willingly turned their backs upon the ministry? Ah! God has laid his heavy hand upon their idols, and thousands of the Church's young men have been swept into the army, and multitudes of them have gone forward to give their account to God, leaving desolated households to mourn their untimely death! This actual decrease of the ministry, already so great, and the probability that the war may lessen the number of candidates for years to come, should most seriously engage the inquiries, the prayers, and the labors of the Church, that she may know, if possible, why God is thus crippling her in this most vital element of her power, and that she may do what in her lies to remedy this evil, in order that she fail not utterly in her mission for our country and for the world.

Having thus taken a view of the mission of the Church as an organization for promoting the great end of all things—God's true glory in the universe—and especially his glory in the spiritual welfare of men, let us, in the remainder of this address, ask your attention to two things, as collateral and subordinate to the specific ordinances of the Gospel, which the Church may legitimately employ, and which she is, to some extent, already employing, to render more efficient these ordinances, and thus the better promote the direct objects of her mission. Guided by the providence of God, which sets before us the aspects of the real world in which, and upon which, the Church is to operate, we hesitate not to say that, in the execution of her work, the Church should lay her hand, as far as she justly may, upon all the controlling agencies of society. They belong to her of right. They have been given to her of God. We name but two as examples.

The Church should control the educational institutions of the world—male and female—from the primary school up through all grades to the college and university. We do not mean that the Church should absolutely possess all these in her organic character, and manage them through her courts. Nor do we mean, especially, that the Church should take the work of common school education out of the hands of the

State, where it properly belongs, and on which, as we hold, rests an imperious necessity, consulting the State's own highest civil and social welfare alone, to say no more, to give a good common school education to all the youth of the land. Nor should the Church improperly interfere with or hinder, much less oppose, the State's proper work in this sphere? But yet, in the exercise of her legitimate functions, the power of the Church should be felt, through her people and her ministers, and in coöperation with all who are like-minded, in shaping aright all State schools, and those of every other description, so that, at the very least, they may be preserved from irreligious tendencies, and may be imbued with a reverence for God's word, and thus become auxiliary to, and not contribute to oppose, the proper work of the Church. When we speak of the control which the Church should thus exercise, we have reference to no particular denomination; we mean Christ's true body, the Evangelical Church at large. The Presbyterian Church, as all the world knows, has been in all countries a leader in the work of education, and long may she wear this wreath of honor. Least of all should she relax her efforts in this day, so marked by the growth of schools and the spread of knowledge, and especially when some of these fountains of influence send forth streams of demoralization and death.

But beyond this sort of watchfulness over schools which are without her pale, why should not the Church—our own Church—have schools of every grade, and for both sexes, directly under her authority—primary schools and academies under her presbyteries, and colleges under her synods? Can she fulfill her duty even to her own children without this? Can she, without this, meet the full demands of her mission in aiding to evangelize the world. If we are not too wise to apply the adage, *Fas est et ab hoste doceri*, we have but to look at the Church of Rome for an example. Her power in this Protestant land, and a power exerted in a way which will tell in the future more than in the present, is a power gained largely through her schools. When we shall emulate her diligence in this department, our influence as a church, in the line of our true evangelical mission, will be increased many fold. We can perceive nothing which would tend to lead the Church

away from her strictly evangelical work, but much every way to promote it, if she should give her energies to build up and endow educational institutions of all grades, man them with teachers of her own communion, mark out for them courses of study which would secure, along with all branches of worldly science, an acquaintance with God's word, and that system of its great truths recognized in our standards, and require reports to be annually made directly to the courts of the Church, or to boards appointed by and amenable to them, imposing thus a responsibility which would give the Church an absolute control, and secure the great end in view. It is a mistaken notion to suppose that such a system would drive away from these institutions all but the Church's own children. On the contrary, while it would be of incalculable benefit to them, saving them from snares to which they are now exposed, the high reputation which the Presbyterian Church has always enjoyed for securing thorough training, would attach to her schools the youth of all classes and creeds. This system has, to a limited extent, been already adopted in our church, and it has been substantially recommended by several General Assemblies. Our wish is that it may become universal. If there is benefit in the system, it should be afforded to all. If there is a demand for it, no period of the world has more imperiously shown it than the present.

In how many of the higher schools of our country are many branches of science so taught and pursued as directly to work into the hands of a popular and God-defying infidelity; while, as to anything which bears the name of religion taught in them, it is but a negation of all positive belief of anything in heaven or upon earth, or a direct inculcation of disbelief in many vital things which are distinctive of Christianity. How many sons of the families of our own communion are sent to such schools, because of their princely endowments, able faculties, numerous libraries, extensive cabinets, and philosophical apparatus, and all the other appliances needful to furnishing the most enlarged facilities for pursuing all branches of knowledge; and how many of these youth come away with biases against the religion of their fathers, or with the seeds of death planted in their souls. These things are known and read of all men. The arch-enemy of the truth works here

with powerful skill and success. Fortunes are still bestowed upon these schools, at a single dash of the pen, securing to them a higher power for evil. With such examples before us, the question is whether the Church has not here a duty to perform, beyond any efforts which she has yet made. Upon the principle we hold, that the Church may and should deal with all matters which vitally affect the morals and spirituality of the world, her duty is clear. The manner of her performing it is no less plain. The Church must meet the enemy upon his own ground. Our church must either renounce her well-earned reputation, fall back from being a leader in the work of education, and a patron of institutions for the highest attainments in knowledge, ignore the existence of a power laying waste her own heritage, and abandon many of her own children, during the forming period of their character, to all the subtleties of these institutions of the devil; or, she must build up competing institutions, with all the enlarged and munificent facilities furnished by them. She is shut up to this alternative. That she may properly do this work, and that she can and should do it, we think unquestionable. Only let her ministry, her eldership, and her members acknowledge its necessity, and the work is already well advanced. She has the means, and can command the men. All that is needed is to be convinced of the duty, and awakened to a sense of its importance, and then Christian men will act in the fear of God.

There is one consideration which should not be overlooked in this connection, showing that the Church should not be satisfied with a standard which might do for other days. The developments, or, if you prefer, the pretensions, of modern science, as received from many of its devotees, lay claim to wonderful discoveries and great advancement beyond any former age; and some of them directly conflict with revelation. We must of necessity follow, somewhat, in the paths which have thus been opened, whether they lead to error or to truth. We must enter that we may detect and appropriate the truth, or that we may expose and warn against the error. This burden is laid upon us. We must take it up and bear it forward, or fall behind in this day of amazing activity and progress. An example or two will show what we mean.

The world-renowned Humboldt, honored by courts and courted by kings as the great high priest of science, after having dwelt upon this earth for some ninety or more years, and traveled extensively over it, and beheld and studied its phenomena which so plainly give testimony everywhere to a Divine architect—sweeping with his comprehensive powers those fields of unmeasured space, where

The Heavens declare the glory of God,
And the firmament showeth his handiwork;
Day unto day uttereth speech,
And night unto night showeth knowledge:

—writes his *Cosmos* in his old age (yet in the full vigor of all his faculties), as the sum of all his researches in science, in which he makes a world without a God! Sir Charles Lyell, in his geological observations upon the *Antiquity of Man*, just issued from the press, in which he gives a *resume* of all the geological facts and deductions bearing on the question, overturns at a single dash all the foundations of Biblical Chronology, places the origin of man on the earth ages prior to the Scriptural account, and thus would quietly upset our faith in the whole system of revealed truth. Agassiz, while consoling conceited Americans with the geological announcement that ours is the Old World, artfully distills the skepticism of the New through his able writings on natural history, possessing all the characteristic subtleness of the French schools of infidelity. In his zeal to maintain a theory, he hesitates not to degrade man to the level of a mere animal, positively “objects to the admission of a distinct kingdom for man alone,” and argues against “a community of origin” for the human race; and the result of his reasonings is to strike down at a blow some of the cardinal doctrines of the Christian system, and destroy the Gospel plan of salvation. And Buckle, another popular orator upon science and civilization, and a true disciple of Comte, adds a powerful ingredient to the potion by which the public mind is poisoned, in the cool and confident assertion, that “religion is on the increase in the world, but theology is declining,” as though there could be true religion without theology; and that “there is no doctrine or truth in Christianity that had not been announced before! And to put the finishing touch to these amazing strides of

what the popular mind drinks in as the profoundest learning, the recent British essayists, holding high places in the English church, and filling chairs in the English universities, some of them wearing the miter and wielding the crosier, boldly maintain that "all cultivated minds regard the religious basis of orthodoxy as no longer tenable, and demand a new reformation which shall bring religion and the Church into harmony with reason."

Such is a specimen of the teachings, from the very highest authorities, which our youth are to meet in the lecture-rooms of our halls of learning, and which, at the hands of many who follow these masters, so greatly infest the highways of literature and science. That the world "does move," is thus clear; but whether in the wrong or right direction, it is ours, if possible, to know, that we may meet the assaults of an ever-shifting skepticism, and save those whom God has committed to our watch and culture. It is essential to a decent self-defense, and essential to our doing our full share in bringing the world to Christ.

It can admit of no manner of doubt, that the proper training of youth, and especially the youth of the Church—the children of the covenant—is among the most important works of the Church's mission. Her present security, her future increase, her prospective power, her ultimate success in all that God has given her to do, depend, in a large measure, upon the attention she may give to the lambs of the flock. And it is because all this is true, and fraught with results so momentous and imperishable, that we would urge the Church to lay her hand to this work, in the way here mentioned. We are well aware that, in order that any right incipient direction may be given, and that any success may result, we must look back to the household as the fountain of all good that is to flow forth. Here God has placed the primary responsibility. It is lodged in the hands of parents and in the bosom of the family. A right beginning made here is full of promise. But how are parents' hopes to be realized, their prayers to be answered, and God's full promise to them to be made good, unless the Church furnish the proper schools into which the child may step when he leaves the parental roof, and through all grades of which he may pass, until the highest attainments in educa-

tion shall be made? Shall he be abandoned by the Church as soon as the parent must dismiss him, and at that most critical of all periods of his life, be given over to schools under the control of the devil? If it be once admitted that the training of her children and youth for the Kingdom of God is a prime duty of the Church, we do not see how it can be fulfilled, unless the Church furnish the means of education to the full extent to which it is deemed desirable or necessary in fulfillment of her duty, that their education shall be carried. If that stage can be reached in the primary school, give them that. If a collegiate course be deemed essential to the position which we would have them take in life, provide that. If we think it well that our Christian youth—the hope of the Church, of our country, and of mankind—should be able, whether they enter the ministry or not, to take rank with any that walk the earth, in attainments in all true science and every branch of knowledge that may be mastered in any of the schools of the world, while, at the same time, they shall in these pursuits be preserved from making shipwreck of an evangelical faith, and come forth and show themselves able in after-life, in conflict with the princes in science, to vindicate the ways of God to men; then let the Church, if she would bring this power upon herself and to her Lord, through her sons, provide, under her own control, the means of this high attainment. She may do it if she will. We well know that the universities of Europe, and some of the older institutions of our own country, afford certain facilities with which there is no competition, and which constitute their great attraction. But must this always be so? It will be if we will it, and yet it will not be if we will it. We would have the Church lay these broad foundations, and rear these noble superstructures, and write upon them from foundation to topstone, “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men!” We would have her thus show to all the world that she has a high regard for her sons and daughters, and a deep concern for the honor of her Saviour, and that there is some better disposition of her wealth than to hoard it up for the ruin of her children.

In carrying out such a system to the highest point attainable, it is not essential that new institutions, in all cases, should

be founded, but that those now on the proper foundation should have their facilities enlarged. In this goodly commonwealth, what hinders making the college of this synod, in due time, equal in all respects to the oldest and highest universities of our own or of any land, but the will of God's people? And what hinders the development of such an interest among the people as shall bring that will to a right decision and to a vigorous action, but proper views to be entertained by the ministry? As to the money needed for this, we should not look to the wealthy alone, nor to the legacies of the dead, but to contributions from every living member of the church. This is the true principle in all the work of the Church. Men and women and children should be taught to "do up their charities," if they choose thus to phrase it, during their lifetime, and through all periods of their life, daily, constantly. Let this doctrine be inculcated from all our pulpits, and sustained by all our courts, and there would be no lack in the Lord's treasury for any of the enterprises of the Church, educational or evangelical.

It is as clear as the light at noonday, that the great battle which Christianity is to fight with infidelity in this age—a contest already waxing hot in some places—is, in part, a battle with what passes under the name of science, and, in part, a battle with that species of scholarship which openly attacks the inspiration and genuineness of the Scriptures. We would, by no means, depreciate the progress which is being made, in our day, in every species of knowledge. We fully concede that science is advancing more rapidly than ever before known, and that no previous time can compare with the present for the ability and learning brought to the study of the Scriptures. But with all this, there is much which passes under these specious terms, which will be found in the end not to bear examination. What we would have the Church do is to meet promptly the demand which such a state of things creates and suggests. If she will not add to our college curriculum what is necessary (or even if she should), let her add to that of her theological seminaries, and, if need be, establish a separate department in each, whose specialty shall be to instruct in the true relations between science and revelation, in order that our young men, who

are to enter the ministry, may be well grounded in those aspects of truth which are now making up the living issues of the times, and which may continue for a long period to come.

But without further pursuing this important and suggestive theme, we leave it with stating the obvious conviction which must possess every enlightened judgment, that the Church is far behind the proper standard of her duty in this whole business of training her children and young men for the work and glory of her Lord. This conviction every one must share who but looks at the actual condition of society in our day, and justly regards the mission which the Church is given to perform for its highest welfare.

There is another educating power in one of the mightiest engines extant for controlling society, on which the Church should lay her hand to a greater extent than she now essays to do. It is that of the press. No one can say that her using it directly is beyond her legitimate province and duty. That point has already been settled by the Church herself in a way which puts her judgment beyond doubt. She admits its power and her duty to use it, as seen in some of her own organic agencies. Her Boards of Publication, her Tract Societies, her Book Concerns, and her systems of Colportage, to spread broadcast an evangelical literature, furnish the evidence. We, therefore, advocate nothing new. It is true, these institutions are but of recent origin. Two generations ago the Church knew nothing of them. They have arisen from the necessities of the case. They are the product of the present age, developed from its special characteristics and marked tendencies. The Church has established them, partly in self-defense against a corrupting popular literature, and partly to augment her aggressive power over the world. In this she has shown eminent wisdom. They are now an acknowledged agency, with which she could not dispense. When inaugurated, prejudices were raised against them. They were an innovation upon the usages of the Church, and unknown to the fathers. In later days objections on other grounds have been raised, and vehemently urged in our highest courts. But the Church has outlived them all. Like theological seminaries, which are also comparatively recent,

the whole Church is now agreed in their necessity. Our Board of Publication takes rank with all our other Boards, is one member of our organic system, and comes annually before the General Assembly to report what it has done in the name and by the authority of the whole Church, to diffuse abroad the truth in a popular form by means of the press. Here is wisdom. Here is progress. But has the Church done all that she may properly do through this potent engine? Do the tendencies and characteristics of the times, which, in a day but recently past, brought into being theological seminaries and publication boards, reveal nothing more which the Church can justly do by the press? We venture the prediction, however it may now be regarded, that the day is not distant when the Church will have journals of every class, from the daily through all the intervening grades to the quarterly, which she can claim, in some proper sense, as her own; or which, at least, she can control to the extent that they shall be so conducted that she may have a solid security that their influence shall help to advance and not retard her great work, and so conducted, that for popularity and power they shall vie with any that the enemies of the Church can control. She should, through her ministry, and she should, through many of her laymen, be able to cope with any writers, in any sphere, and upon any subject, and put the enemies of the truth to rout, while she fights valiantly for her Lord.

The press, in our day, is the great educator of the world. Shall the Church ignore a fact so patent? She must bring it to coöperate with the pulpit and the school. One class of minds, not great in number but great in power—the thinking, reflecting, controlling—are swayed by the quarterly and the ponderous volume; another, and a larger class, more by the the monthly; a still larger, by the weekly; until you come down to the daily, which is the great educator of the masses of the people; the high and the low, not merely in politics and trade, but in morals and religion. As on entering a lordly mansion you may judge of the tastes of the proprietor by the paintings which are suspended from its walls and the statuary which adorns its grounds, so as to the mass of men you shall be able to tell their views of politics not only, but even of morals and religion, by the publications they con-

stantly read. Nor do they always make their selection from correspondences in sentiment upon questions previously and independently settled by themselves. New questions are daily arising on which they have no settled views. On these the masses follow the popular journals they read, whithersoever they may lead them, as certainly as the needle follows the magnet. This is the case with the vast multitude of readers; they read without reflecting, and decide without being able to render a reason. And who needs to be told that the common daily newspaper of our times discusses every subject of religion and morals, from the inspiration of the Scriptures and the genuineness of the sacred books, down through every doctrine of the Gospel and every ordinance of the Church? Is Sabbath observance agitated in any community, the wisdom of Sabbath laws discussed, their repeal urged, the propriety of closing dramshops or of stopping railway trains on that day canvassed? All this appears in the daily journals. And the profoundest questions relating to man's spiritual nature and destiny; whether, indeed, there be another world; whether man is a religious being, and, if so, what is true religion, with abundant evidence to show, to the satisfaction of multitudes, that the Church of Christ is a failure and its members hypocrites; and even the fundamental truth of all—whether there be a God—with plentiful intimations that the conclusion uttered in the fool's heart was right; with all that naturally flows from a trifling so wicked upon subjects so momentous, touching the whole theory of human society, its origin, nature, relations, interests, and duties; all these mighty themes are discussed and decided in the journals of the day, and very commonly in a manner to fall in with corrupt desires, and often in a style so singularly oracular, that multitudes sincerely believe, that from the conclusions announced, there is no escape. And in this manner proceeds the education of the surging, seething, numerically-controlling millions, in whose hands at the ballot-box and upon the battle-field, are held our political destinies not only, but whose influence at home contributes so largely to shape the moral and religious character of society. Can the Church, with these things before her daily observation, fail to see the importance, if not the vital necessity, of making

use of the press in a way she has not hitherto attempted? It is an old saying, which even the Church need not fear to apply, that we must fight the devil with fire. If he is to be met and discomfitted here, it must be with his own weapons and upon his own ground. The press must be met by the press. Satan is the arch-enemy with whom the Church has to contend. Her power in the contest is the truth. The present question simply is, how she shall use it. That is left to her wisdom, guided by the providence of God revealing the character and tendencies of the times. These, we think, unmistakably point out the way which we have indicated.

Even the popular writers of fiction of our day have discarded the old methods of Walter Scott and Fennimore Cooper; and now, instead of issuing the volume, they have laid hands on the periodical press. Dickens is first read through his "All the Year Round;" and Thackeray's productions first appear in "The Cornhill Magazine;" and the effusions of the most popular writers of fiction in our own country, and some of those of Europe, are first seen by us in Harper, or the Atlantic Monthly, or other magazines of that class; and a lower order, but of wider circulation, are found in prints, of which the New York Ledger is a sample; while there is a wide and vastly-deep abyss below all this—a dread abyss!—into which we can not venture to descend, even in name. The aim of this whole class of writers is to reach the multitude and mold them to their will; and in order that they may reach them, they seek channels of communication, or create them, to which the multitude resort. Shall not the Church learn a lesson here from the world? Or, shall it be said to the very end of time, by way of rebuke, as in our Saviour's day: "The children of this world are, in their generation, wiser than the children of light?"

We may perceive how a concentration of church power may be brought into efficient action through the press, by drawing an illustration from the Methodist Episcopal Church. As a denomination, and under church control, they have quarterlies, monthlies, and weeklies. Their General Conference appoints the editors of all these. As they are church publications, their preachers, local and itinerant, are agents for their circulation, and by their rules are regularly called to account

for their diligence in this work. It can be seen at a glance, from such a system, how their entire people, and thousands who read their publications through the diligence of their members from the efforts made beyond their own communion, are impressed with their peculiar views; and what is more directly in the line of their great purpose as a church, this peculiar use of the press reveals, in great part at least, how it is that they exhibit such concentration of power and unity of action in all their strictly evangelical work. That body, in its action, is unquestionably the most compact organization in protestant christendom, and by virtue of this characteristic is able to accomplish far more than without it. Our present purpose does not require us to enter into any criticism upon certain radical features of their ecclesiastical system which contribute to the same end—as the absorbing and the wielding with a strong hand, of all power by their itinerant and local clergy, and above them by a small body of bishops, to the entire exclusion of the voice of the people—but we mean to indicate that one of the greatest levers by which the exclusive rulers are able to move the mighty mass of their membership in carrying out the behests of their imperial will, is the press and their peculiar manner of using it. We have not, however, drawn this illustration for the purpose of urging Presbyterians to adopt this method of employing the press. We know their characteristic love for independency of thought and individuality of action too well to suppose they would do this. Nor is it our opinion that they should. But while these qualities of our character are admirable and valuable within due bounds, we hazard nothing in saying that we might learn a lesson, even here, which would give our church, by a use of the press in a way which she does not now attempt, an efficiency among our own people, and a power in society at large, which we may in vain seek otherwise to wield. Although we have not the data at hand to verify the statement, it is probably true that the number of families in the Methodist Episcopal Church who either take or read some one or more of their own religious journals, approximates the whole number of families in their communion, at least in all the cities and towns; while, on the other hand, as we know from the facts in some of our largest and most wealthy congregations,

and from the actual knowledge which each pastor in our church possesses, or may easily gain among his own people, it is no doubt true that there are thousands of families in the Presbyterian Church, and many among them of the highest social position, who do not subscribe for, read, or see, a religious journal of our church, or perhaps of any kind, from one year's end to another. This we regard not merely the fault of the minister nor of the people thus destitute, but of the Church itself. The conductors of the press in our Church are doing a good and great work, and should be encouraged by our giving a wider circulation to their journals; but this is a work to which the Church herself should put her hand in a way not yet attempted, that she may exert a greater power, and reap a rich reward. If the popular press is the great molder of men's thoughts on all subjects, we should seek to employ it to the utmost of our power for Christ and his cause, or we lose the strongest hold upon the masses of the people. The details of the manner in which this engine should be used will readily be suggested to the wisdom of the Church whenever she is thoroughly convinced that she has a duty here to perform.

We pass by the notice of other agencies which contribute to shape the spiritual destinies of men, regarding educational institutions and the press as beyond competition the most powerful which the Church may properly and directly control. And in respect to these, we ought perhaps to guard our position from possible misapprehension. In saying that the Church, in the execution of her true and purely spiritual mission, should lay hold on these and other controlling agencies of society, we do not lose sight of what we have already laid down as a fundamental principle which is to be adhered to without qualification, that the ordinances proper of the Church—those, and those only, which are specially named in the word of God—are her *direct* reliance, under God and by the power of his grace, for evangelizing the world. The chief of these ordinances, as already stated, is the preaching of the Gospel by the ministry of Christ. Nothing can supercede this. All we have said, therefore, upon education, we urge with a thousand fold more emphasis in behalf of education for the ministry. All we have urged in favor of building

up and endowing institutions of every grade for our youth, we would press under the solemnity of a vastly higher obligation upon all the people of God, in behalf of the seminaries for training the ministry, and giving these schools of the prophets all the facilities which the embodied wisdom of the Church in her highest courts may deem requisite to meet the demands of the age in which we live. Let these instrumentalities be put in the first place of duty by the Church. Let nothing come in to rival or compete with them. The true ministry is directly an ordinance of God; its individual members are called of God; they are Christ's ascension gifts to his Church, and under grace and truth the greatest and best of all. Let the Church, then, recognize the superior obligation to train up a ministry for Christ, and provide all the ways and means thereunto, which these considerations impose. But while we give the ordinances proper of the Church their true place, we claim that the controlling agencies of society which we have mentioned should be used as auxiliaries to make all Gospel ordinances the more effective, by preoccupying the mind and heart of the world, through these means of dominant power, with thoughts and feelings favorable to, or at least not set against, a reception or candid hearing of divine truth. If any should object to the Church herself being concerned in employing the particular agencies named, that they are not specifically authorized by the word of God, we see not why, upon the same ground, our Publication Boards, Colportage systems, and Theological Seminaries, must not give place. But, on the contrary, as the whole earth has been given to the saints of the Most High God through the inheritance of his Son, for an everlasting possession over which Christ is to reign with them forever, most surely, every legitimate power the world contains may be siezed upon by the saints to subdue it to his rightful dominion!

If we have now justly apprehended the responsibilities of the Church, and have rightly judged of the means for the accomplishment of her true mission; if her work, in its good fruits, promotes so highly the welfare of men and the glory of God; and if the times on which we are thrown, in God's providence, call for deeper energy and more enlarged operations in every department of the Church's work, how obviously

do these things indicate the character of the ministry needed to lead the Church in such a mission and at such a time. They should be men of earnest piety, willing to meet opposition and persecution in any form, for the truth's sake, for humanity's sake, and for Christ's sake; men of apostolic zeal, boldness, and faithfulness, who show to all men, by the spirit that is in them, that they are called of God, and have, in their work, the witness and the fruits of the Spirit of God, seeking "not to know anything among men save Jesus Christ and him crucified." They should be also men of eminent practical ability; not men of "genius," so called—let such men rather seek another sphere for the display of their eccentricities—but they should be men of strong common sense, a quality for the ministry next in value to piety; men who can adapt themselves to the world in which they are to work, to human nature and human society as they are; and who go forth to their labors under the power of the single conviction, that the Gospel system of grace, and that alone, can relieve mankind from their spiritual thralldom, and elevate them to the true enjoyment of the sons of God. They should, furthermore, be men of high attainments and thorough training in all that may aid them in vindicating, illustrating, and enforcing the word of God. The question has sometimes been raised, whether the standard of professional attainment should remain at the point settled long ago, or be elevated. Without entertaining the question of the time to be spent in professional study for the ministry, it is manifest that, if anything is to be learned from the present state of worldly science, from the aspects of every form of error, from the boldness of skepticism in high places in the Church itself, under the garb of peculiar reverence for the truth, and from a corresponding irreligion among influential portions of society—all which the Gospel is obliged to encounter in its progress among men—the standard of attainment should be advanced beyond that of former times. This is probably the conviction of all who are employed as instructors of candidates for the ministry, as well as of a large portion or nearly all of those who are actively engaged in the work; and those who may be eager to enter the ministry, and who feel restive under the course now marked out by the Church, will be of

the same judgment a few years hence. The present times, moreover, demand that the ministry should be men of unreserved consecration to their special work, looking solely to the grace of God to give their mightiest or their feeblest efforts success. Secular pursuits, as far as possible, should be avoided. Let the dead bury their dead. Let your farms and your merchandise be managed by others, and obey the apostolic injunction to a minister regarding his duties: "Give thyself wholly to them." These characteristics of the ministry, which the present age preëminently demands—earnest piety, eminent practical ability, high professional attainment, and unreserved consecration—it was, we doubt not, the aim of the founders of Danville Theological Seminary to seek and secure in the candidates who should enter its halls. This we may justly assume to be the aim of its faculty, its directors and trustees, its patrons and its friends. With these views, and animated in honest endeavors to realize them by an eye single to the glory of God, we may justly hope that our labors will meet the approbation of the Head of the Church, and be crowned with his blessing.

Fathers and brethren, such is the work of the Church; such is her true mission, set before us by her crucified and reigning Lord; such are the responsibilities which rest upon all who are to lead the Church in her work; such is the object, as one of the agencies employed, to which the school of the prophets in your midst is consecrated. May we each, in our lot, give to the great work that measure of ability with which God has endowed us, so that we may each receive at last the welcome plaudit: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant!"

ART. VII.—*A Manual of Worship suitable to be used in Legislative and other Public Bodies, in the Army and Navy, and in Military and Naval Academies, Asylums, Hospitals, etc., compiled from the forms and in accordance with the common usages of all Christian denominations, and jointly recommended by eminent Clergymen of various persuasions.* pp. 132. GEORGE W. CHILDS, Philadelphia, 1862.

THE compiler of this little volume is the Rev. Dr. Shields, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and among others who unite in recommending it, we notice the names of Drs. Hodge and Boardman (of our own church), Durbin (Methodist), Williams (Baptist), Bellows (Unitarian), Bishops Potter and McIlvane, and President Woolsey, of Yale, which are sufficient to evince that the work is regarded as eminently catholic in its character. It has been evidently prepared with great care.

If the question as to the use of a liturgy in our church, and by our ministers in the discharge of their official duties, is to be regarded either as open, or as settled in the affirmative, then we can understand why a work like this might be prepared and brought before the public by one of our clergymen. But we beg leave to say that the question, so far from being a mooted one in our denomination, has been from the first settled in the negative by the church *as a church*; that is, by a majority so great that the minority has been nowhere. The fact that in the time of the Reformation there was, here and there, in the Protestant Church, a man who supposed a liturgy to be desirable, and who was fearful of intrusting the management of the public service in the church to any and every minister without specific directions, proves just nothing at all in favor of such a form. All, without exception, had been accustomed to the use of a liturgy, and dispensing with it, and returning to the usage of the primitive church, was, in the state of case then existing, a matter of experiment. One of the fathers has observed that error may at times so prevail that truth itself would be an innovation. And so it was then. But the experiment has long ere this been fully made, and has proved satisfactory. And in view

of it our own branch of the Church of Christ has for more than two centuries rejected the liturgy. And it is hardly in place now, and, after three centuries of successful trial evincing the groundlessness of the aforesaid apprehension, to make that very apprehension itself the reason for attempting to return back to the practice which it sought to inaugurate, and which was a plain departure from the usages of the primitive church.

If, after the careful training which our church has ever demanded of her ministry before entering upon their sacred work, there have been found among them those who can not select appropriate portions of the Scriptures for any occasion whenever their services are required; and who can not, either there and then, or in a hospital, deliberative body, or anywhere else, pray without book; they have been heretofore advised by the church to unite with such denominations as use prayer-books. But if, on the contrary, our ministry do not require them; then we may with reason ask, Why should a pastor of one of our churches prepare such a work? Why should others of our ministry unite with Episcopal ministers in recommending its use? We say without hesitation that we view the whole procedure with feelings of decided disapprobation. In our view it seems like an attempt to establish a precedent contrary to the cherished views and settled practice of our church. And this can not be permitted. If persons who feel unable to conduct family worship without a form of prayer; and if others who, in the absence of a clergyman, may be called to officiate in the army or navy, at a burial, for instance, or in a hospital or deliberative body, are disposed to employ a prescribed form of prayer, let them use it; but this manual was prepared mainly to assist *clergymen* in the performance of their duties. And in this aspect of the case we object to it *in toto*, so far as the ministry of our church are concerned. It is an attempt to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear.

That this manual was prepared mainly for clergymen to assist them in performing their official duties, is obvious. We have "*A form of Divine Service for Public Occasions*," which service is, of course, conducted by clergymen. And another, "*Form of Daily Prayers in National and State Legislatures*;" all

of which bodies are provided with chaplains. We have other "forms" to be used in the army and navy, and for public thanksgiving, humiliation, etc., which were prepared, of course, for those whose appropriate duty it is to officiate on such occasions.

And then, moreover (unless we greatly mistake), in the "Form for Public Worship," the *audible responses* are provided for the congregation, "Deliver us, O Lord," "We beseech Thee, O Lord God." (See pps. 14-17). We know not whether this were really the design of the compiler, but, from the isolated position in which these expressions are formed (not wholly unlike that of the somewhat similar expressions in the English church service), such seems to have been the intention in regard to them. And if this be so, it certainly is a most unwarrantable attempt to innovate upon the recognized and established usages of our church.

Then as to the subject-matter of some of the prayers, we have decided objections to it. In praying for those in authority, there is undoubtedly no impropriety in designating them as *servants* of God. They possess and exercise in professed subordination to Him, authority which he has delegated to such. Hence Nebuchadnezzar, and even Nero, are thus designated in the Scriptures. But this, assuredly can not be regarded as a precedent to justify the application of this term to all men indiscriminately. And so, too, in regard to the terms "children of God," "brethren," etc. There may be a sense in which all men are children of God, as he is the Father of all; but in practical theology, the term has a distinct meaning, as when John says, in reference to Christians, "Now are we the sons of God;" and Paul, "The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are *the children of God*; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ." Can it be proper, then, in the solemn exercise of prayer, to ignore these distinctions, as is done in this manual? For example, in the prayer for the wounded, p. 68, they are called, "thy suffering children." And in the prayer for those under sentence of death for their crimes, p. 68, they (be they impenitent murderers, guerrillas, traitors, and the like) are named "thy servants who for their transgressions are appointed to die;" and these prayers are to be offered in the

presence of the individuals referred to. In like manner, also, in the burial service, pp. 102, 103, we have the following: "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God, in his wise providence, to take out of this world *the soul of our deceased brother*, we, therefore commit his body to the ground; earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; *in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life*," etc. How would such language appear at the burial of the aforesaid impenitent criminals? See, also, the prayer after burial at sea, p. 106.

In like manner "at the funeral of a public personage," p. 96, we have the following Scripture, "Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?" These words as applied to Abner, were literally true, but in what sense is a public personage who is neither an Israelite nor a Christian professor to be regarded as a prince and a great man in Israel? The same remark applies to the language used "at the funeral of a military personage, p. 97, "The beauty of Israel is slain upon thy high places"—language literally applicable to Saul and Jonathan. But in what sense can it now be deemed applicable to an ungodly or infidel commander? In the prayer for the bereaved friends, p. 99, they, also, are called "thy bereaved servants," though they may be ungodly, or infidels, or even atheists. We protest against such an utter misapplication of the words of eternal life.

It is indeed suggested by the compiler that any expressions which do not commend themselves may be easily omitted. But the question here is not about omitting them. It is as to the propriety of their being thus presented and recommended to be used. But our limits forbid us to go more fully into the matter now, and we hope there may be no occasion for resuming the discussion of the subject hereafter. L.

DANVILLE REVIEW.

No. III.

SEPTEMBER, 1863.

ART. I.—*The Union and the Constitution.*

IN what sense and to what extent the people of the United States are one, has heretofore been the subject merely of speculation among political theorists, and of the declamations of party leaders. But amid the throes of a convulsion which has shaken our Union to its center, and threatens to rend it asunder, and prostrate in ruin the temple of liberty which our fathers founded, in the presence of a gigantic conspiracy, avowedly resting on and sanctioned by the assumption that we are not one people, but many, leagued together in a confederacy of independent sovereignties—the question becomes one of the profoundest practical importance. “Let it never be forgotten,” says a recent political writer of eminence,* “that we are one people and one nation *only so far as the Constitution makes us one*. Outside of that bond we are thirty-four people and thirty-four nations, none of which have any more right to interfere with the local laws and institutions of the rest than with the local laws and institutions of China and Brazil. The people of the States have a right, under the Constitution to defend their local laws and institutions by arms, if necessary, and it is the duty of the United States to uphold and aid them in the attempt. A war confined to such an object would not be rebellion, even though the United States were the aggressor.”

* Amos Kendall, in the *National Intelligencer*, February 21, 1862.

That a war against the constitutional rights of any part of the Union would be treasonable, and that in such a case, resistance could not justly be stigmatized as rebellion, is certain; not because the Union is a confederated league of distinct nations, but because any violation of the Constitution, by whomsoever committed, is treason to the sovereignty of "the people of the United States" by whom the Constitution was "ordained and established;" while they who, loyally and in good faith, should maintain the integrity of the Constitution, and oppose its assailants, would occupy the position of faithful lieges and guardians of that sovereignty. But that the American people are a society composed of thirty-four distinct people and nations, is so far from being unquestionably true, that it would rather seem to be without support, whether by appeal to the common sense of men, to sound theoretical principles, or to the criterion of historical facts, the only decisive test on such a question.

In looking into the original sources of our national history, nothing is more manifest, nothing stands out with more distinctness upon the whole face of the record, than the fact that the Union existed prior alike to Constitution and Confederation; that, from the first movement of the colonies in the controversies which resulted in their independence, they all recognized that Union, and their duty of allegiance to it, as already existent realities, not by virtue of any act of voluntary league or confederacy on their part, but from the very manner of their origin and native relations to each other, and to the British crown and people. The Constitution did not create the Union. It only gave it organization and defined relations to the people and to the State governments.

Originally, the American colonies were integral parts of the British nation—the fountain of their blood, the land of their fathers and home of their brethren. They were identified in the common nationality, and subject, in all external relations and general interests, to the paramount authority of the king and parliament. In their migration to America they retained all the rights and privileges of native-born English freemen, and were organized in subordinate colonial governments for the protection and exercise of those rights, and management of local and municipal affairs. While thus re-

lated to Great Britain, the colonies, when first called together in council by the usurpations of parliament, found themselves united to each other, not only by the same ties of blood and nationality which bound them to Britain, but by the common sympathies, privations, and privileges of colonial life, by the joint inheritance of one common country, by the same experience of British aggressions, and by the united purpose to vindicate their native liberties, at every hazard.

When, in October, 1765, upon occasion of the stamp act, the first Continental Congress assembled in New York, the question arose, "Upon what ground shall we vindicate our liberties?" On the faith of our charters, or on the principles of natural rights?" "A *confirmation* of our essential and common rights as Englishmen," said Christopher Gadsden, of South Carolina, "may be pleaded from our charters safely enough. But any further dependence upon them may be fatal. We should stand upon the broad *common* ground of those natural rights that we all feel and know as men, and as descendants of Englishmen. *I wish the charters may not ensnare us, at last, by drawing different colonies to act differently in this great cause.* Whenever that is the case, all will be over with the whole. *There ought to be no New England man, no New Yorker, known on the continent, but all of us Americans.*"* These views were universally accepted, and the Congress, without any act of union, or even a resolve of mutual fidelity, proceeded as "Americans" to vindicate their violated rights, upon the general principles of English liberty.

To the king they "most respectfully shew," "that these colonies were originally planted by subjects of the British crown, who, animated with the spirit of liberty, encouraged by your majesty's royal predecessors, and confiding in the public faith for the enjoyment of all the rights and liberties essential to freedom, emigrated from their native country to this continent, and by their successful perseverance in the midst of innumerable dangers and difficulties, together with a profusion of their blood and treasure, have happily added these vast and valuable dominions to the empire of Great Britain; that, for the enjoyment of these rights and liberties, several

* Gadsden, in Bancroft, Vol. V, p. 335.

governments were early formed in the said colonies with full power of legislation, agreeable to the principles of the English Constitution." *

To the House of Lords they represent, "that his majesty's liege subjects in his American colonies, though they acknowledge a due subordination to that august body, the British Parliament, are entitled, in the opinion of your memorialists, to all the inherent rights and liberties of the natives of Great Britain; and have, ever since the settlement of the said colonies, exercised those rights and liberties, as far as their local circumstances would permit."

Addressing the House of Commons they state that they "most sincerely recognize their allegiance to the crown, and acknowledge all due subordination to the Parliament of Great Britain, and should always retain the most grateful sense of their assistance and protection." Yet they submit, "whether there be not a material distinction, in reason and sound policy, at least, between the necessary exercise of parliamentary jurisdiction, in general acts for the amendment of the common law, and the regulation of trade and commerce through the whole empire, and the exercise of that jurisdiction by imposing taxes on the colonies." †

To the same effect, the House of Representatives of Massachusetts Bay, writing to Lord Camden, Jan. 29, 1768, state that "such are the local circumstances of the colonies, at the distance of a thousand leagues from the metropolis, and separated by a wide ocean, as will forever render a just and equal representation in the supreme legislature utterly impracticable. Upon this consideration it is conceived that his majesty's royal predecessors thought it equitable to form legislative bodies in America, as perfectly free as a subordination to the supreme legislation would admit of; that the inestimable right of being taxed only by representatives of their own free election, might be preserved and secured to their subjects here." ‡

Such was the constitution of the colonies and their relation

* Almon's "Prior Documents," London, 1777, pp. 32, 33.

† Ibid, pp. 32, 33.

‡ Ibid., p. 186.

to the paramount sovereignty of the British king and parliament. Organized under colonial governments, the jurisdiction of which, over all local and internal interests, was exclusive and sovereign, they were cheerfully subordinate to the supreme legislature and crown, in all matters of more general and national concern. The causes of grievance which separated them from Great Britain were not several and diverse, in the several different colonies, but one and the same, common to all, and as such recognized and met by them; not with independent counsels and separate actions, but with perfect unity and accord, by common counsels and the united energies of all, controlled and guided by "the Continental Congress."

The king and parliament properly represented a sovereignty which was not essentially in them, but in the people. Their colonial policy, sustained as it was by the British people, excluded the Americans from the rights and privileges of free-men and equals, and treated them as outcasts and aliens. In pursuing such a course the British authorities forfeited the prerogatives of sovereignty over the colonists, whom they thus constrained to discover, in that government and nation, strangers and enemies. The throne thus vacated was occupied by Congress, at first, as a provisional organ of the common expostulations of America and guardian of her liberties, and at length, as the rightful successor of the derelict monarch, the true and chosen representative of the sovereignty of the American people. The result, therefore, of that convulsion which rent asunder the British empire, was not a disintegration of the American portion. On the contrary, it induced in the colonists a more distinct appreciation of the fact and the value of their unity of origin, of nationality and of interests, and a cordial acquiescence in the necessary and essential conditions of continued union.

CONGRESS OF 1774.

These general ideas have been illustrated in the proceedings of the Congress of 1765. The repeal of the stamp act seemed to promise the return of harmony, but new and oppressive measures of arbitrary power soon revealed the design of the administration to reduce the colonists to a condition of abject vassalage. Again, a Congress was called together, and again

was the Union recognized and attested, not by formal resolution or articles of union or confederation, but by patriot voices, proclaiming it as a recognized fact, arising out of the very nature of their existence as British colonies, and the manner of the aggressions which assailed their common rights and liberties. Patrick Henry, urging the propriety of each respective colony having a voice in the deliberations of Congress, proportioned to its relative population and importance, exclaimed, "Government is dissolved, fleets and armies, and the present state of things show that government is dissolved. Where are your landmarks, your boundaries of colonies? We are in a state of nature. I did propose that a scale should be laid down. That part which was once Massachusetts Bay, and that part which was once Virginia, ought to have some weight. * * * * The distinctions between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, New Yorkers and New Englanders, are no more. *I am not a Virginian, but an American.*"* "At this unhappy period," said Congress, in an address to the inhabitants of the colonies, "we have been authorized and directed to meet and consult together, for the welfare of *our common country.*"†

Neither in the commissions and instructions of the delegates, nor in the steps taken by this body, is there any suggestion of the necessity or propriety of forming a union, or entering into a compact of alliance. But the pre-existence of the Union is recognized and assumed as an admitted and unquestionable antecedent and basis of all their measures. In the commissions given by the colonies of New Hampshire and Maryland, their delegates are instructed to consult and act "for the redress of American grievances." In those of Massachusetts and South Carolina, it is for "the recovery and establishment of American rights and liberties." The other delegates had instructions equally national in their character, and in the same spirit were all the deliberations of the body and the steps adopted.

Addressing themselves to the inhabitants of the province of Quebec, a people separated from them by national origin, by language, manners and habits, and by geographical barriers,

* John Adams' Diary Works, Vol. II, p. 366.

† Journal of Congress, Oct. 21, 1774.

Congress assures them, "We do not ask you, by this address, to commence acts of hostility against the government of our common sovereign. We only invite you to consult your own glory and welfare, and not to suffer yourselves to be inveigled or intimidated by infamous ministers, so far as to become the instruments of their cruelty and despotism; but to unite with us in one social compact, formed on the generous principles of equal liberty, and cemented by such an exchange of beneficial and endearing offices as to render it perpetual. In order to complete this highly desirable union, we submit it to your consideration, whether it may not be expedient for you to meet together, in your several towns and districts, and elect deputies, who afterward meeting in Provincial Congress, may choose delegates to represent your province in the Continental Congress, to be held in Philadelphia, on the 10th day of May, 1775," etc.*

On the 20th of October, Congress adopted certain articles, which have sometimes been incorrectly represented as terms of confederation. The resolutions under which they were adopted, and the articles themselves, alike show that such was neither their design nor nature. The committee by whom they were reported, was appointed to draft articles of agreement for non-importation, non-consumption, and non-exportation, as between America and England. And the articles, after an enumeration of British aggressions, state that "To obtain redress of these grievances, which threaten destruction to the lives, liberty, and property of his majesty's subjects in North America, we are of opinion that a non-importation, non-consumptive, and non-exportation agreement, faithfully adhered to, will prove the most speedy, effectual and peaceable measure: and, therefore, we do for ourselves and the inhabitants of the several colonies whom we represent, firmly agree and associate under the sacred ties of virtue, honor, and love of our country, as follows:

"First. That from and after the first day of December next, we will not import into British America, from Great Britain or Ireland, any goods, wares, or merchandise, whatsoever; or, from any other place any

* Journals of Congress, Oct. 26, 1774.

such goods, wares, or merchandise, as shall have been exported from Great Britain or Ireland; nor will we, after that day, import any East India tea from any part of the world; nor any molasses, syrups, paneles, coffee, or piemento, from the British plantations, or from Dominica, nor wines from Madeira or the Western Islands, nor foreign indigo.

"*Second.* That we will neither import nor purchase any slave imported after the first day of December next; after which time we will wholly discontinue the slave trade, and will neither be concerned in it ourselves, nor will we hire our vessels, nor sell our commodities and manufactures to those who are concerned in it."

After other articles of a similar nature, it is agreed, "that a committee be chosen in each county, city, and town, by those who are qualified to vote for representatives in the Legislature, whose business it shall be to attentively observe the conduct of all persons, touching this association; and whenever it shall be made to appear, to the satisfaction of a majority of any such committee, that any person within the limits of his appointment has violated this association, that such majority do forthwith cause the truth of the case to be published in the Gazette, to the end that all such foes to the rights of British America may be publicly known and universally contemned as the enemies of American liberty; and henceforth we will respectfully break off all dealings with him or her.

"And we do further agree and resolve, that we will have no trade, commerce, dealings, or intercourse whatever, with any colony or province in North America, which shall not accede to, or which shall hereafter violate this association, but will hold them as unworthy of the rights of freemen and inimical to the liberties of this country."

Thus it appears that these articles were so far from proposing to originate a union among the colonies, they pre-suppose its existence, and assert for its representatives the highest and most unquestionable right to the reverence and obedience of each colony and every individual. Under the modest guise of recommendations and articles of association, are couched provisions more stringent, in many respects, than those of the embargo which, a generation later, had almost excited New England to open rebellion; provisions ordained by the sole authority of the general Congress, vindicated by "the love of

our country," promulgated for the defense of "American liberty;" and enforced by a decree of outlawry and a doom of infamy against the recusant, whether individual or colony.

CONGRESS OF 1775.

A few days after the adoption of this measure, Congress adjourned until the 10th of May following, expecting, after so long a recess, to have the means of knowing the effect of their proceedings upon the English government. When the delegates again convened, the battle of Lexington had already been fought, and at the dawn of the day upon which Congress re-assembled, the mountaineers of New Hampshire, with Ethan Allen at their head, had surprised Ticonderoga, and "in the name of the great Jehovah, and of the Continental Congress," planted their flag on the walls of that important post. General Gage was beleaguered in Boston by the courageous yeomanry of New England, called from their plows by the sounds of conflict at Lexington and Concord. The Provincial Congress of Massachusetts had already adopted measures for assembling an army of 30,000 enlisted men, of which that province proposed to furnish 13,600; while appeal was made to New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island for the rest. Over these forces Massachusetts had placed General Artemas Ward.

In such circumstances decisive measures were imperatively incumbent upon Congress. In a somewhat similar case the Congress of the Southern States, at Montgomery, acting on the State Rights theory, proceeded in the first place to enter into articles of confederation; then, with the concurrence of the States of South Carolina and Alabama respectively, to adopt the armies which were beseiging Forts Sumter and Pickens. Not till these preliminaries had been attended to, did the Confederate Congress pretend to a right or attempt to exercise the prerogative of appointing commanders and exercising control over those forces.

Such, however, was not the theory nor the course of action of the Continental Congress of 1775. Conscious of a unity, essential in its nature, and of an authority and power superior to any that compacts or confederations could create, it pro-

ceeded under that sanction alone to exercise, without hesitation or challenge, the highest functions of sovereignty over the colonies and their armies.

It is indeed stated by a popular but inaccurate writer and historian, that this Congress, after having adopted an humble address to the king, "in the face of it, went on to assume and exercise the powers of a sovereign authority. A federal union was formed, leaving to each colony the right of regulating its internal affairs, according to its own individual constitution; but vesting in Congress the power of making peace and war; of entering into treaties and alliances; of regulating general commerce; in a word, of legislating on all such matters as regarded the security and welfare of the whole community. The executive power was to be vested in a council of twelve, chosen by Congress from among its own members, and to hold office for a limited time. * * * Congress lost no time in exercising their federated powers. In virtue of them they ordered the enlistment of troops," etc.*

The only part of this account which has any foundation in fact, is the statement that "Congress went on to assume and exercise the powers of a sovereign authority." The particulars stated as to the terms of the "Federal Union," are taken, with one exception, from the "Articles of the Confederation," which were not adopted until the 15th of November, 1777—two years and a half subsequent to the time to which Irving transfers them. Search will be made in vain for any trace of the compact here described, in the records of the Congress of 1775. Abundant evidence, however, presents itself of the conscious possession and energetic exercise of sovereignty over the colonies.

On the 7th of June it was resolved, "that Thursday, the 20th of July next, be observed throughout the twelve United Colonies, as a day of humiliation, fasting, and prayer." In this resolution, the title "UNITED COLONIES," first occurs on the records of Congress, and was thenceforward used as the official style of revolted America. A few days afterward, measures were adopted for a general enlistment of twelve-months volunteers in "the American continental army." At the same

* Irving's Washington, ch. xxxix.

time it was "Resolved, that a general be appointed to command all the continental forces raised, or to be raised, for the defense of American liberty; that five hundred dollars per month be allowed for the pay and expenses of the general." "The Congress then proceeded to the choice of a general, and George Washington, Esq., was unanimously elected."*

Such was the style of original and unquestioned prerogative in which Congress did not so much assert as exercise a sovereign control over the forces of Massachusetts and the New England colonies, superseding the general whom they had commissioned, and placing Washington in command of all the forces "raised or to be raised," by whatsoever authority, for the defense of American liberty.

Together with his commission, Washington received a declaration to be published at the head of his army, upon assuming the command. "We are reduced," says Congress in this document, "to the alternative of choosing an unconditional submission to the tyranny of irritated ministers, or resistance by force. The latter is our choice. We have counted the cost of this contest, and find nothing so dreadful as voluntary slavery. Honor, justice, and humanity forbid us tamely to surrender that freedom which we received from our gallant ancestors, and which our innocent posterity have a right to receive from us. We can not endure the infamy and guilt of resigning succeeding generations to that wretchedness which inevitably awaits them, if we basely entail hereditary bondage upon them. Our cause is just. Our union is perfect. Our internal resources are great, and, if necessary, foreign assistance is undoubtedly attainable. * * * In our native land, in defense of the freedom that is our birthright, and which we enjoyed, till the late violation of it; for the protection of our property, acquired solely by the honest industry of our forefathers and ourselves, against violence actually offered, we have taken up arms. We shall lay them down when hostilities shall cease on the part of the aggressors, and all dangers of their being renewed shall be removed, and not before."

* Journal of Congress, June 14, 1775.

In the exercise of the same sovereignty which assumed the control of the army, Congress now also established a general post office, with Franklin at the head, and issued bills of credit for the expenses of the war, to the amount of two millions of dollars; which was afterward from time to time increased a hundredfold. These bills were inscribed "THE UNITED COLONIES OF AMERICA," the faith of which was pledged for their redemption.

Another subject that early claimed the attention of this Congress, was the disorganized condition of the colonies, consequent upon the dissolution of the royal governments. On the 2nd of June, a letter was received from the Provincial Convention of Massachusetts Bay, asking "explicit advice respecting the taking up and exercising the powers of civil government," and declaring their readiness "to submit to such a general plan as the Congress may direct for the colonies, or make it their great study to establish such a form of government there as shall not only promote their advantage, but *the union and interest of all America.*" In reply, it was resolved that in order to conform as near as may be to the spirit and substance of the charter, it be recommended to the Provincial Convention to write letters to the inhabitants of the several places which are entitled to representation in assembly, requesting them to choose such representatives, and that the assembly, when chosen, do elect councillors, and that such assembly or council exercise the powers of government until a governor, of his majesty's appointment, will consent to govern according to the charter."*

Similar applications were afterward received from South Carolina, New Hampshire and Virginia, to all of whom answer was given in identical terms, "that if the convention of South Carolina shall find it necessary to establish a form of government in that colony, it be recommended to that convention to call a full and free representation of the people, and that the said representatives, if they think it necessary, shall establish such a form of government as, in their judgment, will produce the happiness of the people, and most effectually secure peace and good order in the colony during

* Journals of Congress, 1775, June 2 and 9.

the continuance of the present dispute between Great Britain and the colonies.”*

The Provincial Congress of Georgia but expressed the common sentiment when, while about to organize a temporary system, it declares that “before any general system or form of government can be concluded upon, it is necessary that application be made to the Continental Congress for their advice and directions upon the same.”†

At length, a general recommendation was adopted, May 10, 1776, in the words:

“*Resolved*, That it be recommended to the respective Assemblies and Conventions of the United Colonies, where no government sufficient to the exigencies of their affairs hath been hitherto established, to adopt such government as shall, in the opinion of the representatives of the people, best conduce to the happiness and safety of their constituents in particular, and America in general.”

A preamble to this resolution was adopted, a few days after, declaring it “absolutely irreconcilable with reason and good conscience for the people of these colonies now to take the oaths and affirmations necessary for the support of any government under the crown of Great Britain, and that it was necessary that the exercise of any kind of authority under the crown should be totally suppressed, and all the powers of government exerted, under the authority of the people of the colonies, for the preservation of their peace, and their defense against their enemies.”‡

“The preamble and resolves of Congress,” says Bancroft, “were, in themselves, the act of a self-determining body.”§ They were predicated upon a state of sentiment in the colonies, which elicited the publication of Paine’s “Common Sense,” in which, among other things, he proposes a plan for the organization of state governments. It was published in the winter of 1775–6; and of it John Adams says, in his Diary, “I regretted to see so foolish a plan recommended to

* Journal of Congress, 1775 Oct. 18, Nov. 3, 4, Dec. 2, 4.

† Steven’s History of Georgia, Vol. II, p. 292.

‡ Journal of Congress, May 10 and 15, 1776.

§ Bancroft, Vol. VIII, p. 384.

the people of the United States, who were all *waiting only for the countenance of Congress to institute state governments.*"* Adams, therefore, published a pamphlet on the subject, the plan of which being followed by some of the colonies, while that of Paine was adopted by others; all were soon organized into governments independent of the crown.

Thus, when the matter is traced, it appears that, so far from the Union being a product of compact between the States, the reverse is true—that the state governments which superseded those appointed by the crown, were established under the advice and authority of the Congress of the Union. It was not until encouraged by the recommendation above cited that South Carolina herself ventured to throw off the shackles of the colonial form of government, and organize a provisional system, which, upon the declaration of independence, was again replaced by a permanent state constitution.

In Pennsylvania and Maryland, the preamble and resolutions of Congress were recognized by the people as having the effect to dissolve the proprietary governments which still existed in those colonies; and they immediately took measures to supply the vacuum so created, by the organization of new institutions—established, in Maryland, through the intervention of the committee of safety, and in Pennsylvania, by the spontaneous assembling of a popular convention which superseded the colonial government.

INDEPENDENCE.

While these various measures were being adopted by the United Colonies, the lingering hope was still cherished, that the British ministry would yet return to pacific counsels, and the broken ties of affection and allegiance be reunited. Amid the conflict and bloodshed of the year, all such hopes and wishes were extinguished, and on the 8th of June, 1776, "resolutions respecting independency" were referred to the committee of the whole Congress. On the 10th, it was resolved, "That the consideration of the first resolution be postponed to Monday, the first day of July next; and, in the meanwhile, that no time be lost, in case the Congress agree

* Works of J. Adams, Vol. II, p. 507.

thereto, that a committee be appointed to prepare a declaration, to the effect of the said first resolution."

In the interval of this postponement, on the 25th, "a declaration of the deputies of Pennsylvania, met in provincial conference, was laid before Congress and read, expressing their willingness to concur in a vote of Congress, declaring the United Colonies free and independent States." On the 28th, from New Jersey, and on the 1st of July, from Maryland, similar communications were received. These communications were made for the purpose of relieving the delegates of those colonies from instructions previously given, which had prohibited them from joining in any step tending to independence. On the 2d of July, the resolution was "agreed to,"—"That these United Colonies are, and of right, ought to be, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown, and that all political connexion between them and the State of Great Britain, is, and ought to be, totally dissolved."

On the 4th, the declaration was adopted and signed; in which, after a rehearsal of grievances and of unsuccessful expostulations, Congress states that "We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, *in the name and by the authority of the good people of these Colonies*, solemnly publish and declare, That these *United Colonies* are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown, and that all political connexion between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved; and that, as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may do. And, for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

That this declaration was an act of the most eminent power, implying a claim to supreme prerogative and sovereignty, is manifest. Its decree was alike momentous in its

bearing upon the authority of king and parliament, and the relations and destinies of the empire and the colonies. By it, the king was dethroned. In the exercise of a paramount power, it deposed the parliament from that supreme control over the general external relations of the colonies which that body had hitherto possessed. It dismembered the empire. The colonies it cut off from their former relations of union and fealty, and decreed the transfer of their allegiance to another sovereign—the Continental Congress itself—whose absolute authority could not be more signally asserted than in these measures, nor more clearly acknowledged by the colonies than by their cheerful acquiescence, and zealous execution of them.

Several points in this transaction have a very signal bearing upon the question of the original and unbroken unity of this nation—the primitive and constant subordination of the states to the central authority.

1. A step so momentous was taken by the Continental Congress without recurrence to the provincial governments in any form, whether for advice or authority. The colonies of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland, were the only ones from whom any expression on the subject was received; and that was unsought, was subsequent, and, suggested by the introduction of the question in Congress, was designed to relieve their own delegates from restrictions previously imposed, and was couched in the modest form of acquiescence in whatever Congress might determine on the subject.

2. The declaration does not even purport to speak in the name of the colonies, whether severally or as a confederation; nor in the name of the people of the several colonies or states. But it is “the representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled,” speaking “in the name and by the authority of *the good people* of these Colonies,” “these United Colonies.”* Those who are aware of the accuracy of the

* The incongruous transition from “states” to “colonies,” in this place, crept in in the process of amendment. The original draft by Jefferson was in these words: “We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of these States, reject and renounce all allegiance and subjection to the kings of Great Britain, and all others who may hereafter claim

political studies of our revolutionary fathers, the clearness of their views, as to the respective sources and boundaries of political authority, prerogative and privilege, and the critical attention given to these points in the composition of all their public documents—and of this above all others—will need no assurance that the precise significance of this language was fully appreciated by the author and signers of the declaration. Of this, abundant illustrations will hereafter appear.

3. The States of the Union, severally, did not pass separate decrees of independence; and, except so far as the representatives of the Union had the right and authority to bind them, their relation of dependence on Great Britain has never been dissolved by any public or official act. But, certainly, a decree such as this, assuming thus to control and determine the allegiance of the States, was an assertion of paramount sovereignty over them, which, unless approval was intended, as much demanded acts of independence on their part, severally, as did the aggressions of parliament on the part of the Union. It need not be proved that any attempt at such an independence would have been held in universal abhorrence.

"I do not believe," says Jefferson, "there ever has been a whig, in any one State, who would not have shuddered at the very idea of a separation of their State from the confederacy. The Tories would, at all times, have been glad to see the confederacy dissolved, even by parties at a time, in hopes of their attaching themselves again to Great Britain."

4. The declaration in express terms, forbids the idea, that its design was to give the colonies several independence of each other. That document was dictated by a "decent respect to the opinions of mankind." To mankind it is addressed, and

by, through, or under them; we utterly dissolve all political connection which may heretofore have existed between us and the people, or parliament of Great Britain; and finally, we do assert and declare these Colonies to be free and independent States, and that, as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

its design is, on the face of it, declared to be, to show the causes which made it "necessary for *one people* to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with *another*, and to assume among the powers of the earth *the separate and equal station* to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them." The tribunal at which the declaration is thus presented—the nations of Europe—had known "The United Colonies" by the history of a conflict carried through years of controversy, negotiations, and war. They had heard the voice of Washington, on assuming command of the continental armies, declare in the name of the Congress of these United Colonies, "Our cause is just. *Our union is perfect*. Our internal resources are great; and, if necessary, foreign assistance is undoubtedly attainable." They had seen the perfection of that union verified by the whole history of the war, and attested by the presence of secret agents from United America at every important court in Europe. In these circumstances, the language could have but one meaning and intention, when "these United Colonies" are declared to be free and independent States. It proclaimed the inauguration, not of thirteen nations, but of "one people," in a "separate and equal station," among the powers of the earth.

The style of the epoch whence the subsequent acts of Congress date, as illustrated in the preamble, and again in the ratification of the very articles of confederation, has a bearing on the present point, which needs no comment. "Whereas, the delegates of the United States of America, did, on the 15th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1777, and in the second year of *Independence of America*, agree to certain articles," etc. "Done at Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, the 9th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1778, and in the third year of the *Independence of America*."

Should any embarrassment to the conclusion here attained be supposed to arise from the plural form of the phrase "Independent States," the same objection applies to the name of the Union as it now exists, "the United States." The suggestion is without force in itself, and is utterly insignificant, in view of the points here developed. In fact, the declaration does not purport, and was not designed to define the relations of the States to each other, but to announce the new relation

which they then in common assumed to Great Britain, and the other powers of the earth.

ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION.

Until the Declaration of Independence, all the measures of the colonies contemplated the hope of a restoration of the old relations to the British government. In this view, Congress itself was regarded as a merely temporary expedient. To obviate, therefore, as far as possible, any jealousy which its existence might induce in Great Britain, and avoid the appearance of arriving at permanence and independence, that body had heretofore cautiously abstained from the organization of a regular form of government for the United Colonies. Its own powers were undefined, and its relations to the provincial governments unascertained. With the new order of things, new arrangements became necessary. Says Ramsey, himself a patriot of the era of the revolution, a delegate from South Carolina to the Continental Congress, and for a year president of that body, "the rejection of the British sovereignty not only involved a necessity of erecting independent institutions, but of cementing the whole United States by some common bond of union. The act of independence did not hold out to the world thirteen sovereign States, but a common sovereignty of the whole in their united capacity. It, therefore, became necessary to run the line of distinction between the local legislatures and the assembly of the States in Congress."* On the same day, therefore, on which the committee was nominated to draft the declaration (the 11th of June), it was resolved, "that a committee be appointed to prepare and digest the form of a confederation to be entered into between these colonies."

The labors of this committee and the action of Congress on the subject, were greatly embarrassed by circumstances incident to the unexpected manner in which the struggle with England had ended in independence, and which seriously threatened to convert their independence of England into a disintegration of the colonies, and involving consequent weakness, anarchy, or ultimate re-subjugation under the royal

* Ramsey's History of the Revolution, ch. XIII.

allegiance. Had independence been the original aim, it would have been easy at first for Congress to organize a general government fully adequate to the emergency, and no question of local jealousy, interest, or authority would have prevented a cordial and general acquiescence in the assumption and exercise by the central government of whatever functions or powers were necessary to the utmost efficiency, and the full development of all the resources of the colonies. The instructions of the people of Hanover, in commissioning Patrick Henry as their delegate to the provincial convention of Virginia in 1774, was the common sentiment of all: "We recommend the adoption of such measures as may produce the hearty union of all our countrymen and sister colonies. United, we stand; divided, we fall. To attain this wished-for union, we declare our readiness to sacrifice any lesser interest arising from a soil, climate, situation, and productions peculiar to us."*

But such was not the course pursued. Congress, still hoping for re-union with England, and maintaining the controversy with her solely in defense of the rightful authority of the colonial governments over their internal affairs—the measures adopted, both by it and by the several colonies, tended to strengthen and fortify the subordinate authorities, and concentrate all power in them, for the ultimate security of their liberties, in case of reconciliation. But no proportionate means were used to strengthen the general government in the hands of Congress, which all regarded as a provisional expedient, that could not survive the return of peace. As a consequence, the Declaration of Independence found the general government without organization; without executive or judiciary; without defined powers; without revenue or resources; habitually acting through the provincial authorities and depending on them for men and means, for all the appliances, whether of government or war. On the other hand, the provincial governments were thoroughly organized, and held efficient control over the whole resources of the country. At the same time, the importunate applications which a helpless Congress was constrained by the public necessities, to urge on these

* Wirt's *Life of Patrick Henry*, p. 90.

governments, brought into continual contrast the weakness of the one and strength of the other.

To these causes are to be added, the natural proclivities of power to aggrandizement; and the disposition, which had grown into a general and confirmed habit—from causes just mentioned—to magnify the importance of the provincial governments. It is not, therefore, surprising that a powerful tendency was manifested in the State authorities to claim an almost absolute supremacy, instead of that sovereignty over local and internal affairs which was proper to them, and in defense of which, the war occurred. Disloyalty to the Union did not exist. All were agreed as to the propriety and necessity of maintaining its integrity inviolate. But many were disposed to attribute such prerogatives to the individual States as were, practically, incompatible with the efficient existence of a central government. These tendencies were confirmed and strengthened by mistaken inferences drawn from the fact that, sustained by the ardor of public patriotism, Congress had been able, by the exertion of a moral power alone, to meet every emergency, and to provide for the exigencies of the struggle, until independence had now been attained.

The committee on “a form of confederation” reported July 12th. Their work was considered in Committee of the Whole, until the 8th of August. It then lay till the following April, when it was again taken up and discussed, from time to time, and on the 15th of November, at length adopted and sent to the States for their sanction. It was not until the 9th day of July, 1778, “and in the third year of the independence of America,” that having been approved by the States, it was finally ratified and signed in Congress. By New Jersey, however, it was not adopted until the 26th of November, nor by Delaware until the 12th of February, 1779, and Maryland withheld her concurrence until the 1st of March, 1781.

The delay which took place in drawing up and adopting the plan of confederation was not favorable to the vigor of the system therein embodied. Mr. James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, in the constitutional convention, remarked, that “among the first sentiments expressed in the first Congress, one was that ‘Virginia is no more, that Massachusetts is no more, that Pennsylvania is no more, etc. We are now one

nation of brethren — we must bury all local interests and distinctions.' This language continued for some time. The tables at length began to turn. No sooner were the state governments formed, than their jealousy and ambition began to display themselves. Each endeavored to cut a slice from the common loaf to add to its own morsel, till at length the Confederation became frittered down to the impotent condition in which it now stands. Review the progress of the Articles of Confederation through Congress, and compare the first and the last draught of it."*

The document, as finally adopted, was entitled, "Articles of Confederation and perpetual union between the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia." According to the terms of these articles, "Each State retains its own sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right, which is not, by this Confederation, delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled."

To the Union were attributed, with one exception, all the functions peculiar to national sovereignty. "The United States, in Congress assembled," were exclusively empowered "to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, regulate the alloy and value of coin, fix the standard of weights and measures, determine controversies between two or more States, and establish a post office and post roads." Except the power "to establish commerce," these include all those which were described in the Declaration of Independence as the prerogatives of independent States, and, as such, claimed for the United States. These powers had heretofore been exercised by Congress, and by it alone; from the first day of its sessions, in 1774—not only in all the earlier periods of the controversy, but after, as well as before, the Declaration of Independence. In fact, these, the prerogatives of independent national sovereignty, were never claimed nor exercised, for a single day, by any State of the Union, until the convention of South Carolina met in December, 1860, eighty-six years

* Elliott's Madison's Debates, Vol. 172.

after the first meeting of the United Congress. The power to regulate commerce was not enumerated in the Articles. Says Ramsey, "As, at the time the Articles of Confederation were proposed for ratification, the Americans had little or no regular commercial intercourse with foreign nations, a power to regulate trade, or to raise revenue from it, though both were essential to the welfare of the Union, made no part of the federal system."*

But while so many of the functions of national sovereignty were attributed to the Union, it was left without any adequate means to vindicate its authority, or give effect to its decrees. As its only source of revenue, "the United States, in Congress assembled," was empowered to assess and apportion a tax among the States. But the taxes thus distributed must "be laid and levied by the authority and direction of the legislatures of the several States." If these failed of their duty, no remedy was provided.

For the executive department, Congress was authorized to appoint "a '*Committee of the States*,' to consist of one delegate from each State; and to appoint such other committees and civil officers as may be necessary for managing the general affairs of the United States under their direction—to appoint one of their number to preside, provided that no person be allowed to serve in the office of president more than one year in any term of three years." The Committee of the States, or any nine of them, was authorized "to execute, in the recess of Congress, such of the powers of Congress, as the United States, in Congress assembled, by the consent of nine States, shall, from time to time, think expedient to vest them with; provided that no power be delegated to the said committee, for the exercise of which, by the Articles of Confederation, the voice of nine States, in Congress of the United States assembled, is requisite." The restriction here referred to provided that "the United States, in Congress assembled, shall never engage in a war, nor grant letters of marque and reprisal in time of peace, nor enter into any treaties or alliances, nor coin money, nor regulate the value thereof, nor ascertain the sums and expenses necessary for the defense and

* History of the Revolution, ch. xiii.

welfare of the United States, or any of them, nor emit bills, nor borrow money on the credit of the United States, nor appropriate money, nor agree upon the number of vessels of war to be built or purchased, or the number of land or sea forces to be raised, nor appoint a commander-in-chief of the army or navy, unless nine States assent to the same."

A plan so imperfect, so fraught with evidence of State jealousy, and so adapted to bring the General Government into contempt, contained within itself the seeds of dissolution. That it was not regarded by its authors as the creation of a new Union or Confederacy, but the organization of that which already existed, is sufficiently attested by two facts, apart from all other evidence. The commission which Washington received from the Continental Congress, on the 17th of June, 1775, he bore unchanged—as well after as before the adoption of the Articles—until it was surrendered by him into the hands of the Confederate Congress, upon return of peace. Nor, in any other cases, were new commissions issued to the officers of the Union, as must have been done, had a new Confederacy or Union then first come into existence.

The other fact is, that, as already stated, the Articles of Confederation were not adopted by New Jersey and Delaware until several months after the ratification by the other States; nor by Maryland until more than two years later. Yet in no respect were the rights and prerogatives of these, as States of the Union, in the mean time, impaired, diminished, or even called in question.

On the contrary, while measures were taken to induce them to accept the Articles of Confederation, their relations as already constituent parts of the Union, were distinctly recognized. It was resolved, "that a committee of three be appointed to prepare a circular letter *to the States in this Union that have not hitherto authorized their delegates in Congress to ratify the Confederation*, informing such States how many and what States have already ratified the same; and desiring that such States will, with all convenient dispatch, authorize their delegates to ratify the Confederation in the Congress of the United States."*

* Journals of Congress, July 9, 1778.

The letter was written, and the States all at length acceded to the Articles. But in the mean time, there was neither interruption nor question as to the continued competence and right of the non-subscribers to enjoy and exercise their previous equal authority and control in all the business of Congress and affairs of the Union.

VOICE OF WASHINGTON.

On the 23d of December, 1783, peace having been restored, and the independence of America formally acknowledged by the British Government, Washington resigned his commission into the hands of Congress. His name suggests a question of no little interest and significance as bearing on the present subject. To what interest, and in whose cause, did he and his armies unsheathe the sword? Was it in behalf of a throng of petty nations? or, in defense of the rights and liberties of one country, one nation and people? His response is given in the address with which, upon this occasion, he resigned the command—a response worthy of “the father of his country:”

“The great events on which my resignation depended, having at length taken place, I have now the honor of offering my sincere congratulations to Congress, and of presenting myself before them, to surrender into their hands the trust committed to me, and to claim the indulgence of retiring from *the service of my country*. Happy in the confirmation of our independence and sovereignty, and pleased with the opportunity afforded the United States of becoming *a respectable nation*, I resign, with satisfaction, the appointment I accepted with diffidence; a diffidence in my abilities to accomplish so arduous a task; which, however, was superseded by a confidence in the rectitude of our cause, the support of *the Supreme Power of the Union*, and the patronage of Heaven. The successful termination of the war has verified the most sanguine expectations; and my gratitude for the interposition of Providence, and the assistance I have received *from my countrymen*, increases with every review of the momentous contest.

“While I repeat my obligations to the army in general, I should do injustice to my own feelings not to acknowledge, in this place, the peculiar and distinguished merits of the gentlemen who have been attached to my person during the war. It was impossible the choice of confidential officers to compose my family should have been more fortunate.

Permit me, sir, to recommend, in particular, those who have continued in the service to the present moment, as worthy of the favorable notice and patronage of Congress.

"I consider it an indispensable duty to close this last act of my official life, by commending the interests of *our dearest country* to the protection of Almighty God, and those who have the superintendence of them to His holy keeping. Having now finished the work assigned me, I retire from the great theater of action; and bidding an affectionate farewell to this august body, under whose orders I have long acted, I here offer my commission, and take my leave of all the employments of public life."

So spake George Washington, in the presence of Congress, sitting under the provisions of the Articles of Confederation. Even then, the dream of our plural nationality found no harbor in his clear and discriminating mind. In the same spirit was the response of Congress:

"The United States in Congress Assembled, receive, with emotions too affecting for utterance, the solemn resignation of the authorities under which you have led their troops with success, through a perilous and doubtful war. Called upon by *your country* to defend its invaded rights, you accepted the sacred trust, before it had formed alliances, and while it was without friends, *or a government to support you.* * * * * * We join you in commending the interests of our dearest country to the protection of Almighty God, beseeching him to dispose the hearts and minds of its citizens to improve the opportunity afforded them of becoming a happy and respectable nation." *

ART. II.—*The General Assembly of 1863.*

THE proceedings of the supreme judicatory of our Church, at its annual convocation, are of so much interest to the whole body represented in it, for the time present and to come, that it has long been deemed best to give a somewhat different, if not more durable, form to the more important

* Journals of Congress, December 23, 1783.

matters under consideration, than they are likely to receive in the reports of the daily or weekly press.

In the review we propose of the transactions of the General Assembly recently held, we shall notice the chief subjects acted upon, with a sketch of some of the discussions, taking for our guide the account of the proceedings found in several different papers, and the official reports made to the Assembly. At the time we write (June, immediately after the rising of the Assembly, and before the printing of the official minutes), we have access to no other means of information. For the opinions we express, we are of course alone responsible.

It is not important, in the manner of our review, that the business of the Assembly should be noticed in the precise order, chronologically, in which it was transacted.

OPENING SERVICES.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States met by appointment in the First Presbyterian Church in Peoria, Illinois, on the 21st day of May, 1863. This was the seventy-fifth annual meeting of the body. Its sessions were opened with a sermon by the Rev. Charles C. Beatty, D. D., Moderator of the last Assembly, from Ephesians, iv: 7: "But unto every one of us is given grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ."

This discourse has been published in full, and we have read it with interest. It is a sound, practical exhibition of certain characteristics of the Church—as unity, completeness, stability, symmetry, and progress—and breathes, throughout, the spirit of brotherly kindness and charity. Its wide circulation will do great good.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS.

After these devotional services, the Standing Committee of Commissions presented the roll, from which it appears that there were present two hundred and fifty ministers and ruling elders. As the roll was printed early in the sessions, it is probable that the complete official minutes, as usual, will show a still larger number in actual attendance. Even as it now appears from the list before us, the number present was

six more than all who attended at Columbus, Ohio, in 1862, and only fourteen less than attended in Philadelphia, in 1861. At the last named meeting, certain Presbyteries in the Synods of Virginia, Nashville, Memphis, Mississippi, and Texas, were represented, wholly or in part, by sixteen members. Deducting this number (as none of the Presbyteries in these Synods have been represented since 1861), and it appears that the meeting in Peoria was larger than the one last held in Philadelphia.

This exhibits the important facts—that our Church, notwithstanding the schism occasioned by the withdrawal of Presbyteries and Synods in the revolted States, had been making steady and healthful progress; and the wonderful advancement of our country in all the elements of substantial prosperity, as seen in the consideration that the larger of these two meetings was held in a thriving city of what was only a few years since a frontier State, and the smaller in a city, outside of which, it was deemed by some good people, not long ago, almost an unpardonable heresy to suppose the General Assembly could properly meet at all.

ORGANIZATION.

Rev. John H. Morrison, of the Presbytery of Lodianna, Northern Indiana, who has been twenty-five years a devoted missionary to the heathen, was elected Moderator on the first ballot, having for his competitors, Dr. Nevin, of Philadelphia, Dr. Young, of Butler, Pa., and Dr. Wines, of New York. Besides the just tribute paid to the merits of the man and to the missionary cause in the bestowment of this honor, another feature of this election is worthy of a passing notice. The Moderator is not a D. D. Though published in several of the papers with this appendage to his name, the roll printed by the authority of the Assembly omits these formidable letters, while it carefully appends them to the name of each of the three clerks. We therefore conclude that the Moderator *had not yet* suffered this infliction. And yet he was chosen over three well-known doctors. We do not learn that any dissent was entered to this election. Let our untitled brethren take courage; their claims will not be overlooked.

Without in the least underrating the merits of the unsuc-

cessful candidates, we are decidedly pleased at this feature of the case. It is but the fifth instance of the kind out of seventy-five elections since the origin of the Assembly. The last of the four was in 1809, fifty-four years ago. We have sometimes seen in our judicatories titled merit pushed quite too far forward, and we therefore rejoice the rather at this action of the Assembly.

Rev. James H. Mason Knox, D. D., of the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, was elected Temporary Clerk.

PERSONNEL OF THE ASSEMBLY.

Not to know some men may argue one's self unknown, as saith a great authority. But a glance at the roll fails to reveal the names, with a few exceptions, of those who are prominent in the Church, either as members of previous Assemblies or otherwise. Passing by the distinguished men of the extreme South, some of whom have been present in every Assembly, but the last two, for twenty years past, we do not discover the more noted men of the East, West, or Middle States, who have so often led the discussions of the Assembly, impressed their views upon its measures, and contributed so largely to shape the progress of our Church. A noticeable illustration of this is seen in the fact that Dr. Humphrey was the only member of the late Assembly who had ever been Moderator previous to Dr. Beatty, who was the Moderator of the Assembly next preceding. It has been quite unusual not to have in attendance, as members, a goodly number of men who have filled the chair in former Assemblies. There were four present in 1862, and three in 1861, while before the last named year, at least half a dozen might sometimes be counted.

But, judging from the reported discussions on some of the subjects canvassed and decided, the Assembly of 1863 was a body of men of marked ability. It occupied eleven days in its deliberations, a portion of the time holding three sessions a day, had a large number of judicial cases before it, and besides disposing of the business connected with the various Boards and Theological Seminaries, which is always of a very important character, and attending to the usual routine affairs

of the body, it determined some questions of as great moment as ordinarily come before any Assembly.

COMPLAINT OF DR. R. J. BRECKINRIDGE AND SIXTEEN OTHERS
AGAINST THE SYNOD OF KENTUCKY, ON THE RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE IN THE CHOICE OF PASTOR.

This was a case of very grave import, and had been pending a considerable time. The matters involved in it directly concern every particular congregation belonging to the Presbyterian Church in connection with the General Assembly, whether in our own land or upon heathen ground, which now has a pastor, or desires, or ever expects, to establish that relation; for it affects the pastoral *status* as such. And as "the pastoral office is the first in the Church, both for dignity and usefulness," according to our form of government, we can conceive of few questions of higher interest which can be submitted for the determination of a church court.

We watched the progress of this case through the late Assembly with more than ordinary solicitude. The time spent upon it shows its importance as viewed by the Assembly. It was taken up on the second day of the sessions, canvassed more or less for several days, and the final decision was not reached till the evening of the last day, just before the Assembly was dissolved.

The gravity of the issues involved, the judgment pronounced by our highest court, together with the interest which is naturally felt in the case by the churches in Kentucky, where it originated, incline us to devote to it a large space, and to give as full an account of it as our information will admit, and also the material portions of the debate it elicited in the Assembly.

Its history, as we learn, is this: It originated in certain questions addressed to the Presbytery of Louisville, in regard to the right of suffrage in the election of pastors, which were referred for answer to the Synod of Kentucky. The answer of this Synod was in effect that no persons are competent to vote in the election of pastor except those who are professors of religion, in full communion with, and contributing to, the support of the Church. From this decision, Dr. Breckinridge and sixteen others complained to the General Assembly.

Upon this complaint the case was first brought before the Assembly of 1861, and the Judicial Committee, of which Dr. Jacobus, of Allegheny Seminary, was chairman, recommended the following as the decision of the Assembly: "That, whereas the Form of Government does not exclude those from voting for a pastor who are members of the congregation, but not members of the Church, provided they have complied with the requirement in Form of Government, chap. xv, sec. 4; therefore, the protest and complaint be sustained, and the decision of the Synod be reversed." A motion to adopt this report was discussed at some length, when, on the next day, "Dr. Monfort moved, as a substitute for the report of the Committee, the following: '*Resolved*, That the complaint be dismissed, for the reason that it asks the Assembly to reverse an opinion delivered *en thesi*, and therefore not properly a cause of complaint.'" This resolution was considered on several different days, when finally the Assembly adopted the following: "*Resolved*, That inasmuch as there is now no sufficient time to discuss the subject, the case be referred to the next General Assembly."

It came up in the Assembly of 1862, and, on report from the Judicial Committee, was put upon the docket. It does not seem to have been discussed in that Assembly, but on the last day of its sessions but one, "on motion of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge was referred to the next Assembly."

In the Assembly of 1863 it was reported by Dr. Humphrey, Chairman of the Judicial Committee, as in order and ready for trial. When the time for its consideration arrived, Dr. Humphrey, one of the complainants, opened the discussion in their behalf. His speech is represented as one of great ability and power. The correspondent of the *Philadelphia Presbyterian* says of it: "The speech of the Rev. Dr. Humphrey, who appeared for the complainants, was a model for clear, succinct statement, and forcible argument, rising, at times, into a fervor which was exceedingly impressive, and secured for the speaker the undivided attention of the house."

His argument on the case was substantially as follows:

"I. The judgment of the Synod is erroneous, because, (1.) it rests on a wrong interpretation of Form of Government, chap. xv., sec. 4—where two classes of electors are described, those, namely, who are professors

of religion in good standing, and those also who, though not communicants, are stated contributors and regular members of the congregation. (2.) It adopts an unsound theory of the church. Beginning with the proposition that the church should elect its own pastors, it terminates in the conclusion that those only who profess religion should be allowed to vote in the election. But baptized persons, though not communicants, are, according to the definition of our Confession, members of the church. (*Conf. ch. 25, sec. 2.*) The Synod virtually excludes these either from its idea of the church, or from their rights under that idea. (3.) Inconsistent with the position assigned by our standards to the baptized. According to Book of Discipline, chap. i, sec. 6: 'All baptized persons are members of the church, are under its care and subject to its government and discipline.' *Comp. Directory for Worship, chap. ix., sec. 1.* Why should those who are 'subject to the government and discipline' of the church, be prohibited from voting in the election of their rulers?

II. The judgment of the Synod is an innovation on the established usages of the Presbyterian Church. It can not be denied that the prevailing rule among us, from the beginning, has allowed contributing as well as communicating members of our congregations to vote for pastor. Among the Methodists the bishop, among the Episcopalians the vestry, among the Congregationalists the church and the society or parish, sitting in separate houses, appoint the pastor; but with us the members of the church and stated contributors most generally form the electoral body.

III. Many of the most valued and liberal supporters of the gospel are deprived of their just rights by the Synod. (1.) A parent is allowed to choose teachers for the secular education of his children; should he have no right of choice as to their religious teachers? (2.) May not a man, although not a professor of religion, have at least a single vote in the choice of one who is to have free access, as a pastor, to his family, and to be on terms of sacred intimacy with his wife and children? (3.) His personal salvation may be at stake on the choice of a pastor whose preaching shall edify him and whose wisdom shall ruin his soul. Why should he not be consulted? (4.) Here we find the distinction between the ruling elder and the minister of the word. The ruling elder is to be elected by the communicants alone, because his office of rule extends only to them; but the minister should be elected by the regular and contributing members of the congregation, because his office, as a teacher, extends to all who stately hear the word of God from his lips. His relation as a *teacher* is the same precisely to those who profess, and to those who do not profess, to be Christians. Hence, at the ordination of the ruling elder, one of the questions is: 'Do you, the *members of this church*, acknowledge and receive this brother as ruling elder?' etc. But

at the ordination of the pastor the question is: 'Do you, the *people of this congregation*,' etc. *From Gov., chap. xiii., sec. 4, chap. xv., sec. 13.*

IV. Many of the people of God are deprived of their rights by this decision. The poor communicants may be allowed to vote on the ground that their just proportion of the expenses of the congregation is nothing. But under the rigid ruling of the Synod what rights have our wives and adult children, being professors of religion and not contributors? The suggestion that they are contributors through their husbands and fathers, is a mere legal or rather ecclesiastical fiction.

V. The judgment complained of is contrary to the real spirit of the Christian dispensation. This spirit made itself manifest, historically, in the fact that Peter was called to preach the gospel to the Gentiles, by the Holy Ghost, speaking through Cornelius, an unbaptized Roman; and in the call addressed to Paul, in a vision by the man from Macedonia. Even the missionary to the heathen, this day, is moved to undertake his mission, first by the work of the Holy Spirit on his heart, and the last command of Christ, and then, also, by the cry for the bread of life which comes up out of the bosom of the pagan world. These circumstances are not to be pressed so far as to be styled, in the technical sense, 'calls to the office of a christian pastor'—they simply exhibit one of the peculiarities of the dispensation which was overlooked by the Synod.

VI. The evils ascribed to the liberty of suffrage contended for by the complainants, are unreal. (1). In case an attempt is made by the 'outsiders,' as they are called, to force on the communicants an unwelcome pastor, the presbytery will surely interpose. (2). The usage has been general for more than a century, and it has not filled our congregations with unfaithful or incompetent pastors. It has worked well; with fewer evils and more advantages than could be experienced under the exclusive and rigid rule adopted by the Synod."

In the afternoon of the same day this case came up again in order, when Dr. Humphrey stated that there was another complainant upon the floor, and asked to know if the privilege of response would be granted the complainants after the close of the defense. The Moderator replied that without some special action of the Assembly he would feel obliged to proceed in accordance with the usual custom, which denied it. On motion, however, the privilege of response was accorded the complainants by vote of the Assembly. The discussion then proceeded as follows:

"Rev. Mr. Bayless, of Kentucky, from the complainants, wished to say a word in reference to the alleged danger of allowing outside parties

to take part in elections in the Church. So far as his experience had gone the results had always been good, and the effect had been to bring many into the church who otherwise would have remained outside.

Rev. Richard Valentine, of Louisville, stated that he had not come as a representative of the Synod of Kentucky, and had not expected to be called upon to defend the action of that Synod; but he had voted with them, and believed their decision to be correct. In reply to the protestants, he contended, 1st. That the Synod did not base their decision upon a new theory of the Church. They did not deny the membership of baptized children who were non-communicants, but they claimed that until they professed faith in Christ, they were not entitled to the right of suffrage in the election of a pastor. 2d. That the installation of a pastor is a spiritual act. The persons who make the call promise 'obedience in the Lord' and submission 'in the due exercise of discipline,' which non-professors can not do. 3d. The call of a congregation is the external evidence of the call of Christ through the Spirit to the ministry, and upon this the ministry proceed to ordain. Now, can Christ's call to the ministry be made through ungodly men? Are they his agents by whose instrumentality he makes known whom he has called to be his ambassadors? The call of the heathen is for a teacher, not for a pastor, for the missionary can not sustain that relation to them until they have become a church. 4th. In Apostolic times, elders and deacons were called by the church. The reason is stronger in the case of a pastor than in that of an elder or deacon, because the office is more spiritual. 5th. Non-communicants do, in effect, 'refuse to submit to the discipline of the church, properly administered,' by refusing to take the vows of God upon them, and thereby evading the discipline of the Church. No members are therefore excluded, who are truly worthy of the privilege. The speaker feared the Assembly would judge of the merits of the decision of the Synod by the feebleness of their advocates, and that they would be led into a wrong decision by the thrilling arguments which had preceded his. The complainants have the advantage. They come with able advocates and supported by strong names; and with the advantage of the opening and closing arguments, will leave such an effect upon the minds of the Assembly as will lead them to an incorrect decision.

Rev. H. V. D. Nevius was then called. He did not know that he ought to speak, as he was not present when this action was taken by the Synod, nor could he fully indorse that action. The speaker was proceeding to explain his position when he was called to order, upon the ground that the proper order at this time was the defense of the Synod; and upon the ruling of the Moderator, Mr. Nevius relinquished the floor.

Rev. Mr. Reed, from the Presbytery of Transylvania, thought the outsiders had no right to come inside and direct the affairs of the Church. They were hewers of wood and drawers of water. They were outside supporters, right and proper in their place, but had no right to enter into the affairs of the church. So far from cutting off the privileges of parents in the election of religious teachers for their children, their real good was secured by confining the right of suffrage to professors. While out of Christ they were not qualified to select religious teachers for their children, and they should be thankful there are those who are qualified by grace to do this work for them. As to the call of the heathen, they were passive recipients of the Gospel. The Spirit of God calls and the Church ordains. Peter went to Cornelius because the Holy Ghost sent him, and such was the reason he assigned when called to account by the Apostles.

Rev. Mr. Scudder thought the paper which formed the reply to the protest was a sufficient vindication of the action of the Synod, and therefore he would say but few words. What he had to offer he would suggest under four heads without amplification. 1st. As the Church is the body of Christ, voting for its officers belongs only to professors. 2d. The Scriptures do not authorize the world thus to interfere with questions affecting the interests of the church. 3d. The clause promising 'submission in the Lord' implies that those who call a pastor are professors. 4th. The practical workings of giving this right to outsiders, is most injurious. He knew cases where excellent pastors, loved by their communicants, had been extruded through the action of outsiders. He believed the experiences of the churches in Kentucky had proved these difficulties not simply imaginary.

Rev. Mr. Perkins, of Paducah, believed that the practice of the Churches in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama, had been, according to the decision of the Synod. In those localities members who were not communicants had never taken part in the church. He heartily supported the action of his Synod. He loved the world, but did not believe in shaking hands with it and taking it into the house of God, of which they formed an humble part.

Mr. Hubbard, of Paducah, also addressed the Assembly, sustaining the action of the Synod. He could not recognize the validity of the arguments which had been brought against it. The only construction he could place upon the rules, denied the right to any but members of the church, submitting to its discipline, to take part in the elections in the church."

The case came up again on the next day of the sessions, when the Moderator announced the order to be the further

hearing of the defense. Rev. J. P. McMillan, of the Presbytery of Louisville, was called, and spoke as follows :

"He fully agreed with his colleagues in defense of the Synod, and had but little to urge beyond what they had said. There was one point, however, upon which they had not dwelt as strongly as he wished, and that was the exclusion of those who did not contribute their proportion to the support of the Church. The decision of the Synod was that those members who voluntarily subscribed to the support of the former pastor, and then persistently refused to meet their voluntary engagements, had no right to vote in the dismissal or election of a new pastor. They were covenant-breakers, repudiating a just debt ; and no Church had a right to call a new pastor while in debt to the old one. He hoped the Assembly would be careful not to uphold any such immorality. The speaker illustrated his position by supposing that the Moderator had in his pocket one thousand dollars—which, said he to the Moderator, would not be a violent presumption, if you were not a minister (laughter)—and should deed it away to prevent payment of a debt, it would be a gross immorality. So in regard to the non-payment of pastors' salaries. No Church should be allowed to escape from the penalty of non-payment of salary to a former pastor, by being allowed to call a new pastor. It would be encouraging covenant-breaking."

As all the members present from the Synod of Kentucky, who desired to speak in defense of their action, had now spoken, and the response of the complainants being in order, the Moderator stated that no new arguments could be allowed to be introduced, and that they must confine themselves to answering arguments adduced by the defense. Dr. Humphrey, in behalf of the complainants, said they would treat the Assembly much better than that, and waive the right of response.

The roll was called that the members generally might express their opinions on the case. The material portions of the debate, which we find reported, are as follows :

"Rev. A. T. Rankin called for the reading of the decision of the Synod of Kentucky, and remarked that this was an exposition of the words of the Book. But it was not a correct exposition of the Book. It speaks of the 'people,' and not members or communicants. He referred to the election of elders, where the language contemplates members, but in the installation services of a pastor, the word congregation is used. In a call, the subscribers are those who contribute, according to the words used in

the call. These are the electors. It is a new doctrine sought to be imposed by the Synod of Kentucky upon their people. The rule of the Book is simply designed to exclude refractory or dishonest persons. He was proceeding, when he was called to order by the Moderator, who stated that the arguments on both sides were closed, and that nothing but brief expressions of opinion were now admissible. Mr. Rankin therefore resigned the floor, simply remarking that 'he was decidedly against the Synod and for the complainants.'"

The Rev. Dr. Lillie spoke as follows :

"MR. MODERATOR:—I regard this case as one of exceeding interest and importance. It might even be questioned whether any other case of equal importance is likely to come before the Assembly. But for this very reason, utterly unused as I am to speak in such a presence as this, I have feared, I confess, to trust myself in any off-hand remarks. I have rather sought here to indicate my way of looking at the matter in a few written sentences, which it will probably conduce to brevity as well as distinctness, if you will allow me simply to read. I find myself then unable to agree altogether with either of the parties to this suit. Both of them, I fear, have got upon extreme ground, to which it will not be well for the Assembly to follow them.

1st. On the one hand, the right of voting for pastor is claimed for all who submit themselves to church censures, and for all who contribute to church expenses. The latter class, indeed, may include any number of unbaptized worldlings. But they, too, on the strength of their fifty cents or five dollars a year, are entitled, it seems, to coöperate on equal terms with the church of God, in choosing those who shall rule and teach in the household of faith. In defense of this sort of largest liberty, we have been referred to the case of the devout and large-hearted Centurion, who, fearing God with all his house, sent, in obedience to an express Divine command, for an Apostle to deliver his evangelical message. We have been referred to the case of another Apostle passing over into Macedonia with the same message, under an equally direct call of God in a night vision. We have also had pressed upon us what certainly struck me as a somewhat vague, transcendental theory of the changed relations of the church and the world in these latter days—a change, in virtue of which, if I correctly understood what was said, not only is the church now sent into all the world, bearing Christ's truth and grace to the perishing, but the world is brought into the church, as an auxiliary, if not a coöordinate power. Of all this, sir, I have nothing to say but this—and I say it with sentiments of sincerest regard and affection for the venerable appellants—that the illustrations appear to me to be as irrelevant as the theory itself is, I am persuaded, novel, and subversive

of all sound principles of church order. Not for a moment can I believe that our Presbyterian fathers intended in that book to teach their children any such theory of the church, or of the government of the church. So much for what I have ventured to characterize as one extreme view of this matter.

2d. But now, on the other hand, the Synod of Kentucky, as I judge, has rushed into just the opposite extreme, though one by no means so perilous as that to which the appellants would push us. The Synod appeals with confidence to the Book, and as the decision of the Assembly must, I presume, rest entirely on the interpretation of the Book, let us again look carefully at the section in dispute—chap. xv, sec. 4: ‘In this election no person shall be entitled to vote who refuses to submit to the censures of the church regularly administered, or who does not contribute his just proportion, according to his own engagements, or the rules of that congregation, to all its necessary expenses.’ This being the law of the case, the Synod, I conceive, is perfectly in the right, as against the appellants, in at once and peremptorily excluding from the number of constitutional voters all unbaptized persons. The Church of God can know such only as strangers and foreigners. But when the Synod next proceeds to restrict the right of suffrage still further, to what we call professors of religion, or communicants, I must again seriously demur.

In the first place, if so simple an idea was all that was meant, it is not conceivable that the Book should have expressed it in such a singularly, awkward, and roundabout way.

But, secondly, it does seem but obvious, on the face of the book itself, that it contemplates, not a single class of voters, but two classes. And the distinction between the two is, not that the one class consists of baptized professors, and the other of contributors of all sorts, baptized or unbaptized, but rather this, that while both classes are silently assumed, as a thing of course, to have been alike baptized, the one class is found walking as loyal and obedient children of the church, and the other class shows its regard for gospel institutions merely by helping pecuniarily to sustain them. It was not to be anticipated by the framers of the Book, that any belonging to the first class would refuse to support the ordinances, or would prove to be delinquent in the fulfillment of their pledges, or that if they were found to be thus sacrilegiously dishonest, the Church would withhold her censures. However common these alternatives, one and all, may be in actual experience, they were not, I say, to be formally assumed in the establishment of our constitutional law. Accordingly, sir, it will be perceived that the phraseology of the section runs, not thus: ‘No person shall be entitled to vote who refuses to submit to the censures of the church regularly administered, *and* who does not con-

tribute his just proportion according to his own engagements ;' but thus : 'No person shall be entitled to vote who refuses to submit to the censures of the church regularly administered, or who does not contribute his just proportion,' etc. Clearly indicating, as I said before, that the latter clause was added for the very purpose of including certain parties not embraced in the clause preceding, and these other parties I understand to be baptized, non-professors, contributing faithfully of their substance for the maintenance of the house of God, in whose outer courts, at least they too desire to still abide. I can not doubt, therefore, that in forbidding this class to exercise the right of suffrage, the Synod erred, and that to that extent, but no farther, the complaint should be sustained.

Allow me, however, to take one other step, and inquire whether even the first of the two negative clauses of the Book necessarily excludes the baptized non-professor. 'No person shall be entitled to vote who refuses to submit to the censures of the church regularly administered.' But with what justice can a man be said to refuse to submit to church censures, to which he is never once called upon to submit? And is there a church or presbytery represented on this floor that has ever even attempted to deal with the baptized non-communicants as really members of Christ's church, engrafted into Christ, partakers of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and under engagement to be the Lord's. Alas, sir, are we not here again brought face to face with what must ever be regarded as the grand standing opprobrium of our ecclesiastical polity? Holding fast, as we do, to the blessed doctrine of God's covenant with the families of the faithful, we do yet allow ourselves habitually to ignore the intimate church relations of the baptized, and to speak of them, and preach to them, and pray for them, as if the thrice holy name had never even been named upon them ! Oh, let us not, then, think to shift off from ourselves the responsibility of our own neglect, or cowardly unfaithfulness, by charging the baptized children of the church, who at any rate show their measure of grace and love by their outward support of ordinances, with refusing to submit to censures, which we ourselves, for whatever reason, have never offered to inflict. In a word, sir, I can not vote *simpliciter* for either sustaining or not sustaining the appeal. I would sustain it in part, in so far, that is, as the Synod's decision goes to disfranchise any of the baptized who do *not* refuse to submit to the censures of the church regularly administered, and do contribute their just proportion, according to their own engagement, or the rules of that congregation, to all its necessary expenses.

Dr. Wines said : The question before the Assembly is a question of constitutional law. It is to be decided, not by feeling, or expediency, or even usage, but by interpretation. The part of the constitution bearing upon the question is found in the 4th, 6th, and 7th sections of the

15th chapter of Form of Government. There is, however, it must be confessed, an ambiguity in the language of the 4th section. The provision to which I refer, reads thus: 'In this election (*i. e.* of a pastor), no person shall be entitled to vote who refuses to submit to the censures of the church, regularly administered, or who does not contribute his just proportion, according to his own engagements, or the rules of that congregation, to all its necessary expenses.' The object of this provision is to define the persons entitled to vote in the election of a pastor. But the phraseology is not perfectly clear; it is not quite certain whether one class of persons is designated, or two. It is impossible, therefore, to decide the question by this provision alone; since, if the language employed means but one class, the persons composing it must, of necessity, be communicants; but if it means two classes, one of them may be composed, in part at least, of con-communicants. Now, which of these interpretations is the true one? The provision itself is obscure and indecisive. But there is a well-established principle of legal interpretation, which lifts the obscurity and conducts to a solid conclusion. It is this: If any part of a law will admit of two constructions, one of which is consistent and the other inconsistent with the other parts of it, the former must prevail over the latter, in any fair interpretation of the whole law. The application of this principle to the present question is, in my opinion, decisive of the true meaning of the Book. The 6th section contains the form of a call to the pastorate of a congregation. This form embodies, among other things, a promise of support, encouragement, and obedience in the Lord. From the words, 'in the Lord,' in the connection in which they stand, it has been argued on the part of the Synod, with some plausibility, that all who vote for the pastor must be 'in the Lord' as Christians; that is to say, they must, at least, *profess* to be regenerated and living members of Christ. This, I admit, is the natural and obvious construction, and if there were no other provision of the constitution bearing upon the point, it might perhaps be regarded as imperative. But there *is* another provision bearing on the point, and one which has, as I think, a controlling effect upon its interpretation. The 7th section declares who may be authorized and required to sign the call to the pastor elect. It says that this may be done by the elders and deacons, by a select committee, or by the trustees, according as the congregation may elect. But from the origin of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, non-communicants have served, with the sanction of all our ecclesiastical courts, from the session to the General Assembly, as trustees in our congregations. Now, on the interpretation which confines the right of voting for a pastor to communicants, what sort of constitution have we? What is the language which it holds? It says that non-professing trustees may not *participate* in the

choice of a pastor, but they may be required to sign the call to him, when that choice has been effected by the suffrages of others. It says that they may not *vote* for their minister; but they may be *made* to give a pledge to support, encourage and obey him in the Lord. It says that they must stand outside the door, while the election is in progress; but the moment it is accomplished, they may be called in and *compelled* to give bond for the salary. This would be, in my judgment, little short of mockery. It is, to say the least of it, so glaringly inconsistent and self-contradictory that it is not to be admitted for a moment, if any other interpretation is possible. But another interpretation is possible, for, as we have seen, the 4th section may as readily and fairly indicate two classes of voters as one, and the words 'support, encouragement, and obedience *in the Lord,*' in the 6th section, need not be interpreted with the precision which would be required in the statement of a thesis in divinity, but may not be understood as meaning simply Christian support, encouragement and obedience, or as giving to the covenant a deeper solemnity than it would otherwise have, and imparting to it something like the sacred sanction of an oath. The language of the 7th section, which authorizes the signature of the call to a minister by non-communicating trustees, therefore, must in all fairness, as I conceive, be held to control the interpretation of both the 4th and the 6th sections.

On these grounds and reasons, and in accordance with what I believe to be a fair and just interpretation of the Constitution of the Church, I feel bound to give my vote, in this case, to sustain the appeal, and thereby to reverse the judgment of the Synod of Kentucky.

The Clerk proceeding with the roll—Dr. Blackwood stated that all the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, England, and Ireland confined the right of suffrage in 'calls' to communicants. They allowed supporters to present a separate paper, but the Presbytery always acted on the call of the communicants. If the Synod of Kentucky was not sustained, the question must come up again soon before the Church. The question was whether the Holy Ghost qualified ungodly men for deciding whom Christ called to the ministry. The Church could not long allow that matter to stand undecided.

G. Junkin, Jr., made a short but very able argument. His positions were, 1st. The words church and congregation mean the same when applied to a particular church in our Form of Government. 2d. None except willing subjects of Jesus, our king, have the right of suffrage. 3. No others can promise 'obedience in the Lord.'

Dr. Nevin maintained, 1st. That those whom 'the God of this world had blinded,' were not qualified to call spiritual officers. 2d. Baptized children who did not come to the Lord's table, disfranchised themselves.

Rev. J. Thomas defended the complainants: 1st. A bishop must have a good report from those that are without. 2d. In the ordination of elders the words are, 'do you of this *church*,' but in that of ministers it is, 'do you of this *congregation*.' 3d. All churches in the world allowed the people some voice in the choice of pastors.

A. Sterling said that in his, which was the oldest church in Baltimore, they had allowed non-professors to vote, and he thought this practice general in the church.

Dr. Brown contended that all attendants in a congregation were like those in the Jewish nation in the broad sense 'the visible church.'

Dr. Young sustained the complaint. 1st. The course of the Scotch churches in admitting a second paper was *in effect* allowing outsiders to vote. 2d. The phrase, 'the worldly maintenance which you have promised' applies to that class also.

Dr. Brownson concurred with Dr. Young. 1st. Ruling Elders were called to a spiritual office by private members, but the call of ministers was a call to persons already invested with office to serve a particular church. 2. The official relation of the minister is different, as he preaches the word, is received into families, etc.

Rev. G. Carpenter called the attention of the Assembly to the marginal reading of the Book used previous to 1821, viz.: 'none vote but regular members and those who sustain the pastor.'

Rev. S. Wilson sustained in part. 1st. Baptized persons whose moral character is not good are ecclesiastically dead. 2d. Those whose moral character is good should have the right to vote. 3. Females should not vote because they are to obey their husbands.

Rev. J. Carson sustained the Synod. He referred to the third class. Dr. Wines said there were two classes of voters. The complainants said there were three. The third class, if allowed, did really buy their votes. It was like the Romish doctrine of the sale of indulgences, and ought not to be allowed in any church.

Elder J. Strine said that the session of his church had become convinced that it was not expedient to allow non-professors to vote.

Judge Clark sustained the complaint for the following reasons: 1st. Usages in their favor. 2d. The language and history of the Book also. When Erskine seceded from the Church of Scotland even he admitted that non-professing heritors might vote. 3d. Any difficulties may be arrested by Presbytery. 4th. The decision of the Synod of Kentucky, if sustained, would bring the Church in conflict with the State, in some cases where certain charters are held.

Rev. J. Wiseman replied to Judge Clark in reference to Erskine. He left the Church of Scotland on account of the toleration of Unitarianism. The matter of suffrage had nothing to do with his secession.

Mr. W. said that allowing non-professors to vote was like allowing rebel soldiers to vote for officers of the Government.

Judge Leavitt sustained the complaint. His reasons had already been anticipated. The interpretation of the Synod was contradicted by the history of the church, and if the interpretation of the Book was doubtful the course of the church had decided it.

Rev. E. S. Wilson showed from the Digest that previous to 1820 the persons allowed to vote were styled 'regular members.' He also showed from Form of Government, chap. viii, that the session was called a 'congregational assembly,' and the church 'the congregation of believers.'

Mr. Malone continued the argument of the preceding speaker by referring to chapter ix, section 6.

Rev. J. C. Hanna contended that any government in church or State was in the hands of its citizens. Thought female members should vote—also minor professing children.

Rev. G. W. Ash sustained the Synod, but thought it not advisable to enforce it where the practice of the church was different.

Revs. J. Worrell, G. S. Inglis, R. Frame, H. B. Thayer, J. Fleming, F. A. Pratt, and Mr. Crosby continued the discussion, commenting upon arguments previously used.

Rev. G. Ainslie presented the following difficulty in defense of the position of the Synod. A and B are both regular contributors. Both are guilty of the same misdemeanor, not affecting their moral character as citizens, but unworthy of a church member. A is a church member, and coming under the censure of the session, loses his right of suffrage, but B not being a communicant retains his right.

Rev. W. E. Westervelt thought baptized members should have some privileges, as distinguished from the world, and one of those privileges was the right of suffrage.

Rev. W. Wilson said that all the arguments in favor of the complainants were from expediency and from pecuniary considerations. In Kansas non-professors do not ask the privilege of voting. No one would unless he was trained to claim such rights, for the common sense of men would teach them that they had no right of suffrage. In his State the Legislature, at the suggestion of Presbyterians there, had made it necessary that even Trustees must be church members. This was the only safe course.

Rev. A. Munson, during a ministry of twenty-five years, had never known any other practice than that recommended by the Synod."

The vote was now taken, and resulted: in favor of sustain-

ing the complaint, *seventy-four*; for sustaining in part, *forty-five*; for not sustaining, *thirty-seven*.

On motion of Dr. Nevin, a committee was appointed "to express the sense of the Assembly upon the case, with a view to harmonizing the sentiment." The Moderator appointed Drs. Lillie, Wines, and Nevin, and Elders Leavitt and Junkin. At the evening session, on the last day of the meeting, Dr. Lillie stated that the committee had been unable to agree, and would present three reports. Dr. Wines then read the following:

"The undersigned, who voted with the larger part of the Assembly, in the case of Dr. Breckinridge and others, complainants *vs.* the Synod of Kentucky, in its action limiting the right of voting in the election of a pastor to communicating members of the church, recommend the adoption of the following as the judgment of the Assembly in the said case:

Resolved, That the complaint be sustained; but the Assembly in this judgment does not intend to condemn a practice prevalent in some of our congregations in which the right of voting for pastor is confined to communicants.

(Signed,)

E. C. WINES,
H. H. LEAVITT.

Dr. Nevin, in behalf of himself and Mr. Junkin, offered the following

"The undersigned, members of the committee appointed to prepare a minute expressive of the sense of the Assembly, on the complaint of R. J. Breckinridge and others, against the Synod of Kentucky, respectfully recommend the adoption of the following:

The Assembly sustains the complaint in so far as the action of the Synod declares that our Form of Church Government restricts the right of voting for a pastor to full communicants, to the exclusion of other baptized members of the church. But the latitude of suffrage which the complainants plead for seems to the Assembly too vague and tending too much to obliterate the scriptural and constitutional distinction between professing and baptized members and persons who have no other connection with the church than the contribution of funds to support her ordinances.

The Assembly is of opinion that while no one is *entitled* to vote except professing Christians and baptized persons, not under censure,

Dr. Lillie, for himself and others, read a protest, which was admitted to record, against the action of the Assembly, in the adoption of Dr. Wines' paper. This protest does not appear in any report we have seen, or we would insert it; and the same with regard to an answer, if any was made; for we have aimed to give everything relating to this important case which presented any opinion, argument, or principle, that its entire history, and all the proceedings of the Assembly upon it, might be spread before the reader. At the risk of being tedious, we present a few thoughts which the case suggests.

1. That the decision of the Synod of Kentucky was erroneous, and the complaint just, we have no manner of doubt. We speak only of the simple issue upon the right of suffrage; for we have not, at any time, seen the papers of the Synod, or the complaint, in form. We know nothing of the language or arguments of either. But the point in dispute is clear. Nor is our judgment recently formed. We have never, since we have been in the ministry, entertained any other view of the law which governs the case, nor of what seems to be equitably demanded in regard to all whose interests are affected by the pastoral relation, nor of the scriptural principles on which the law is supposed to rest. Nor have we often met those of a different opinion. And as to the practice of the Church, our observation and experience have coincided. Every congregation with which we have been acquainted, where a case of instituting the pastoral relation has come up, has acted on the principle contended for by the complainants, and the judicatories above have ratified their action. We believe there is a general conformity among the churches to a practice contrary to the decision of the Synod. Until a comparatively recent period, this practice was well-nigh or quite universal from the origin of our Church in this country, according to many who have had large opportunities for observation. A different practice has more recently arisen, founded upon, as we believe, an erroneous theory of the Church. It was, therefore, quite time that this new theory should be tested before the higher courts. As further proof that the principles controlling the practice were well-settled, and generally concurred in, this is the first instance, so far as we are able to discover, in which the question, in a

judicial form, has been fully discussed and decided by the General Assembly.

2. Whatever may have been the practice of the Church, however, the real question at issue is one of interpretation or construction of our Form of Government. We take this to be the question between the Synod and the complainants, though, as before stated, we have not seen any of the papers. Both parties, we understand, admit that our constitution sets forth upon the point the true scriptural doctrine. The question is not, then, in fact, "What is the scriptural theory of the church upon the right of suffrage in forming the pastoral relation?" But it is, rather, "What theory does the constitution recognize, and what, therefore, is the true meaning of its language?"

The law might have been expressed in more explicit terms, but we think its meaning sufficiently clear both to guide and guard the people in the exercise of their rights. The language of the section of the law, brought chiefly into question, is in these words: "In this election, no person shall be entitled to vote who refuses to submit to the censures of the church, regularly administered; or who does not contribute his just proportion, according to his own engagements, or the rules of that congregation, to all its necessary expenses." We have always understood this to describe two classes of electors: (1.) Church members who are in good standing, or who are submissive to discipline. (2.) Those of the congregation who are not church members, but who are regular contributors to its expenses under the conditions stated. As a question of simple interpretation, we note three things:

First. It is a well-settled rule, applicable to all like cases, that the established practice which prevails under any form of law, beginning with those who, in good faith, framed the law, and continued by their successors for generations following, without being seriously questioned, determines the intent of the law. By this rule, the meaning of constitutions and laws in civil affairs is settled. By it, titles to property are regulated; and especially where undisputed possession has been maintained for a prescribed time, and no fraud appears. By the practice of the Apostolic church, we determine the meaning of some important portions of written revelation,

and much concerning other things relating to the order and perpetual law of the church. Tried by this rule, founded in the clearest principles of reason, the prevailing practice of the church in all parts of the country, from the beginning till now, must settle the meaning of the law upon the extent of suffrage in the choice of a pastor.

Second. As to church members, their entire qualifications as electors are fully embraced in the first member of the sentence of that part of the law in question, and involve, simply, good-standing, or, if under censure, submission to discipline when duly administered. This comprehends everything. It was not necessary to add to these specifications the qualification of contributing to congregational expenses, mentioned in the second member of the sentence. This latter duty is covered by the language which specifies the former. No member of the Church can, in fact, be in good standing, unless he contributes his "just proportion" to its expenses. We regard "giving" as a prime duty, a grace, an act of worship, as much so in its time and place as prayer or praise; and no member can fail in this duty without being censurable. This is according to the true theory of the Church, and the practice of apostolic times. It is the theory of our standards, and of the fathers who framed them; and if our parochial courts came up to the full discharge of their duty, they would administer "the censures of the Church" as readily for withholding these dues from the Lord's treasury, as for violating any other rule appertaining to his kingdom. Our Form of Government puts "making collections for the poor, and other pious uses," among the "ordinances established by Christ;" and the Directory for Worship prescribes "a collection for the poor, or other purposes of the Church," as one of the several acts of worship in the house of God on the Sabbath. These "collections" include, of course, in the meaning of our standards, all that may be paid for the pastor's salary, or for any other "necessary expenses" of the congregation, whatever may be the mode, in any congregation, in which these funds may be raised. No church member can omit this duty of contributing, and be in good standing. It was not necessary, therefore, to specify this particular duty, regarding this class of electors, any more than to point out any other duty.

The language which is used applying to them, covers the whole ground. The duty of contributing being thus necessarily involved in the qualifications specified, concerning church members, only the first branch of the sentence applies to them.

And here we can not forbear adding a passing remark, that the views of thousands of the Lord's good people are wrong in supposing, when they "contribute" their "just proportion," or any other sum, toward paying their pastor, that they are giving to the *man*, and bestowing a "charity." It may be so, in fact, in the intention of the donors. But the true idea is, that these are "gifts to the Lord," just as the gifts for the service under the old dispensation were. It is indeed the same, whether building a house of worship, "paying off the preacher," or contributing to any of the operations of the church, educational or evangelical, at home or abroad. These gifts should all be regarded as paid into the Lord's treasury, and as a service done *directly to Him*, which he commands, and, when properly done, which he accepts. If any member be too poor to contribute, the rule would not apply to him, or rather his "just proportion" would be nothing; but we do not believe the case ever existed where a member could not contribute something, both to sustain the Gospel where he worships and to spread it abroad, even if it were not more than "two mites," or one. The church needs a practical reform on this whole subject, and the place to begin is with the ministry, the elders and the courts, and then the people will understand and discharge their duties.

Third. Heads of families, and others in the congregation, though not members of the church, may vote for pastor, on contributing as stated. The latter member of the sentence in question is intended to apply to such. The qualifications of voters, in all elections, ecclesiastical and civil, must be determined by some test. In the case in hand, the only palpable test which could well be applied to those not members of the church is the one here laid down. The congregation may fix each one's "just proportion," or leave that to the contributor. As a question of interpretation, solely—the only light in which we are examining it—we think the law plain in its terms and intent; and these, judged by prevailing practice from the first,

settle the rights of parties upon the question of suffrage, beyond reasonable doubt.

3. The decisions of the General Assembly are always to be respected. It can not make law, but it is generally conceded that it is within its province, as a court, to interpret the constitution already made, for itself and for the whole church. We are not aware that all its decisions, even within its proper sphere—and especially those of mere interpretation of law—are binding in such a sense that it would be necessarily and always an offense in a lower court, or in a congregation, or a minister, to disregard them. We find no law for such an opinion. If such disregard is censurable, it is so only by inference. In judicial trials of actual cases its decisions are final. But in cases of mere construction of law it may be different. The Assembly is a new body, each year. What one Assembly may pronounce, as an opinion, about the meaning of the constitution, another Assembly may change. This has been done. No Assembly is infallible. "All synods and councils may err, and many have erred." And yet, while conceding all this, it must be maintained, that, except for the gravest reasons, the decisions of the supreme judicatory, made upon full hearing and careful deliberation, should be cheerfully submitted to and sacredly observed. In the case under consideration, the Assembly has given a judgment upon a matter of vital interest to the whole church. To this judgment we trust a ready acquiescence will be given. The gravity of the case, however, warrants a scrutiny into the subject-matter of this judgment.

4. What did the Assembly really decide? Its final action presents a very singular aspect of things. We confess to a disappointment. The minute adopted, embodying its judgment, is plainly the result of a compromise, and that, too, upon a radical principle of church government affecting the most sacred interest of every congregation under its care. Look at the votes, taken on three several occasions, and under three special aspects by the case; and examine, also, the three reports made by the committee, presenting conflicting principles—a committee appointed, according to the mover, "with a view to harmonizing the sentiment," and, according to the Moderator on announcing the committee, "to reconcile the

vote upon the complaint." But, above all, look at the report which was finally adopted, and which sets forth the Assembly's decision. This "judgment" really *decides nothing* as to the naked merits of the case pending between the parties at its bar; or, rather, we may say, that while it pronounces, in form, for the complainants, it does in fact practically set the decision aside, for it leaves the exercise of the right of suffrage in each congregation just where it was before. It purports judicially to decide a case between parties, and to settle the law on the only issue made; and then it allows, in express terms, the party condemned, and all others who may choose, to act directly contrary to the "judgment" announced! If this had been done by any other body than our highest court, we should deem it little less than serious trifling. Look again at the minute. It is determined "that the complaint be *sustained*;" and this by a vote of eighty-three to fifty-six. This, if it were all, would be of value. It would be a determination of the law, and a guide to congregations in their future action. It would settle the meaning of our Form of Government on a great principle of church order, at least in the view of that Assembly; and while it would "sustain the complaint," it would be equivalent to a solemn reversal of the decision of the Synod. If this be claimed as the effect of the "judgment," we reply that it looks very awkward and unsatisfactory, to say the least, to find that by the same vote, and in the self-same resolution, it is said, "but the Assembly, in this judgment, does not intend to condemn a practice prevalent in some of our congregations, in which the right of voting for pastor is confined to communicants."

Taking, then, the whole, and it is very evident that this decision *settles nothing upon the point of law*. It is really no interpretation whatever of the law, upon the issue joined, worthy of a *court*, when rendering a *judicial decision*. Legally, it leaves matters where they were before. Practically, it leaves each congregation to construe the law for itself, and to act accordingly; and thus opens a wide door to a contrariety of practice under the same statute, and under influences, on one side or the other, which are often not commendable, and upon a question of forming one of the most important of all relations known to the church. We doubt whether the minute

adopted will prove satisfactory to either party in the case, or to the church at large. It would have been better, if the Assembly *had* an opinion, had it decided, one way or the other, squarely upon the simple issue made; and either by its "judgment" restricted the right of suffrage, in all the churches, to those in full communion, or declared the right open, by the Form of Government, to all for whom the complainants contended, and enjoined the churches to comply. All our churches would then have been on the same basis touching the pastoral relation, and if any were aggrieved the matter could have been brought before some future Assembly.

While we do not approve the minute adopted, we regard the other two reports equally or more objectionable. They both deny the right of suffrage to any but "full communicants and other baptized members of the church," while the complainants contended for the right in behalf of other contributing members of the "congregation," and which the Assembly "sustained," so far as it decided their case at all. But we should have much preferred the adoption of such a resolution as that reported by Dr. Jacobus, upon this same case, from the judicial committee of the General Assembly of 1861, viz.: "That, whereas the Form of Government does not exclude those from voting for a pastor who are members of the congregation, but not members of the church, provided they have complied with the requirement in Form of Government, chap. xv, sec. 4; therefore, the protest and complaint be sustained, and the decision of the Synod be reversed." This covers the whole ground, meets the issue squarely, and is clear and decisive. In express terms, it gives an explicit interpretation to the constitution, upon the meaning of which the case arose; sustains the view of the law taken by the complainants, reverses in fact and form the decision of the Synod; settles for the guidance of the whole church a radical principle of church order; and leaves compromises to matters for which they were intended. We sincerely wish such a minute had been adopted.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH OTHER BODIES.

Many years ago, the General Assembly was in fellowship with numerous religious bodies, at home and abroad, partly through annual epistolary correspondence, and partly by an

interchange of delegates. This extended to most or all the Congregational Churches of New England, the Dutch Reformed Church and others in this country, and to the Scotch and Irish Presbyterian Churches and others across the Atlantic. Several years since, from causes deemed sufficient, this correspondence was suspended with one after another of these bodies, the movement beginning in some cases (perhaps in all) with the Assembly, until the Reformed Dutch Church and the Associate Reformed Synod of the South were the only ones left. Within two or three years past, a disposition has been manifested to open correspondence with several churches with whom we have had no such intercourse, and to renew with some others that which had been suspended.

At the Assembly of 1861, the Committee on Foreign Correspondence reported that Rev. John D. Gibson was present as a delegate from the Associate Reformed Synod of New York. He represented the Synod as desirous of Christian correspondence with the Assembly. He was welcomed, and addressed the Assembly, and Dr. Sprole was appointed delegate to the Associate Reformed Synod of New York. Dr. McMullen, of Tennessee, was also appointed, at this meeting, delegate to the General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. This was the commencement of correspondence with these churches. The correspondence with the Reformed Dutch Church and with the Associate Reformed Synod of the South was continued by the appointment of delegates.

At the Assembly of 1862, all these churches were represented but the last named, whose failure was occasioned, we presume, by the war. At this Assembly, Rev. Robert Watts, of Philadelphia, was appointed to represent the body in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Also, a correspondence was opened with the General Assembly of the New School Presbyterian Church, by letter, which resulted in the mutual appointment of delegates, who appeared at each Assembly respectively held in May last. A correspondence was also opened, by letter, in 1862, with the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, and delegates from each Assembly attended their respective meetings held the present year.

In each of these several instances—one of renewed and three

of entirely new correspondence—except the one first named, the initiatory steps were taken by our own Assembly. We hail these results as a good omen, tending to draw into a more intimate fellowship those bodies which hold the essentials of our common faith, and whose principles of church order and forms of worship are so nearly alike.

UNION OF THE OLD AND NEW SCHOOL CHURCHES.

Memorials for the union of these two branches of the Presbyterian Church were presented from the Presbytery of Chippewa, and from Messrs. Warden and Day, of Colorado Territory. They were referred to a special committee, consisting of Dr. Condit, Mr. Spear, and Dr. Young, and Elders Clarke and Newkirk, who presented the following report, which was adopted :

“The committee to whom was referred the memorial from the Presbytery of Chippewa and Overture No. 1, respecting the union of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church, called the Old and New School, report that they have endeavored to consider the subject in that careful and serious manner which its importance demands, and would submit to the Assembly, for their consideration and adoption, the following resolutions, viz. :

Resolved, 1. That, in the judgment of this General Assembly, it is not deemed expedient to take, at this time, any decided action with reference to a re-union of the New and Old School Presbyterian Churches.

Resolved, 2. That, in the fraternal correspondence now happily inaugurated, the General Assembly would recognize an initiative in the securing a better understanding of the relations which subsist between the two Assemblies, and the means of promoting that mutual charity, and that just apprehension of the true grounds of Christian union and fellowship, which may serve to prepare the way for a union that shall be harmonious, and permanently promotive of the interests of truth and vital godliness.

Resolved, 3. That, as a still further preparative to such a desirable union, the General Assembly deem it important—and this in reference to both these branches of the Presbyterian Church—that the ministers and ruling elders, and such as have the care and instruction of the young, be increasingly careful to exhibit clearly the distinctive principles of Christian doctrine and sound polity as held by the Presbyterian Church ; that the ministers of these two branches of the church cultivate fraternal intercourse and interchange of views and feelings ; and in all suitable ways encourage and aid one another in the appropriate work of the ministry ;

and that the members of the one or the other branch connect themselves with existing congregations of either, rather than cast in their influence and their aid with bodies whose principles and form of government are foreign to their own."

This action we deem judicious. No papers calling for the union were presented but the two above mentioned, showing that there is no urgent call on the part of the church at large. The papers presented were from frontier settlements. We can appreciate the desire which brethren situated in sparsely settled regions must feel for the union into one church of the few scattered Presbyterians among them. But this can be effected without a step for which the church, as a whole, seems not prepared. If these brethren of the Old and New School churches could cordially unite, in their several congregations, after a union of the bodies at large through the General Assembly (even if it should be within the competency of the Assembly to enact such union), they can do it without such action. If the elements of enduring union do not exist in their convictions and feelings, they would not be prepared for it after any formal action by the General Assembly. Our brethren upon the frontiers, or any where else, who desire union, need not, therefore, wait for the Assembly to act. Within the State of Kentucky, until within a few years past, there were both New and Old School churches in all parts of the State. These are all now united under the same ecclesiastical rule, and they took all the steps essential thereto, of their own voluntary motion.

We are decidedly in favor of the union sought by these memorials, and in favor of a far more extended union than they call for. We would rejoice to see the union of all true Presbyterians, divided now under different names; but not until they can come together in good faith as one body—one in doctrine, order, and worship—so that the union may be one of compactness and strength, founded upon principles which will conduce to harmony, confidence, and effective co-operation in every good work. We trust that good day will yet come. Until it shall come, these various bodies can accomplish more for our common Christianity as they are at present situated. That it has not yet come, we infer from the fact, that no general call has been made upon the Assembly to take measures leading to

such union. That local unions would be greatly facilitated in some respects by such a general one as these memorials contemplate, we can readily understand; but the general good should not be sacrificed to local convenience.

PLACE FOR THE NEXT MEETING.

On the second day, the question of the next place of meeting came up. Boston, Washington City, Pittsburg, and Newark, N. J., were nominated. After an extended discussion, the vote resulted as follows: Boston, 136; Newark, 74; Washington, 15; Pittsburg, 6. Boston was thus chosen by a decided majority on the first ballot.

On the evening of the last day, just before the close of the sessions, the Assembly reconsidered the vote for meeting in Boston. This action was eminently wise. A feature of the brief discussion which ensued is worth noticing, if for no other reason than *that it is suggestive*. We give it as reported in a Peoria daily: "A motion to select Newark called forth Rev. Mr. Brown in favor of the claims of Washington. A member from Baltimore stated that the feeling in his Synod was decidedly against the holding of the Assembly in any of the Border States. Newark, N. J., was then selected by a rising vote as the place for holding the next Assembly."

The feature to which we refer is found in the remark of the unknown Baltimorean. We are at a loss to divine the reason of it. We deeply regret such a speech, and sincerely trust the speaker misrepresents the Synod for which he claims to speak. We should still more regret to know that he truly represents that "feeling;" that it is "decidedly" entertained; that any presbytery or synod in the church, which thinks it proper to be represented in the Assembly, or any man who would consent to be its representative, should be opposed to its meeting within its bounds; or that any Presbyterian can entertain the impression, for a moment, that such a question as the place of meeting should be at all affected by any local "feeling," or even local judgment, further than the body may choose to consult its own personal convenience or propriety; for the General Assembly—and so of the Synod and the Presbytery—has an inherent right to meet anywhere within its own bound which it may elect, without waiting for an invitation or ask-

ing permission ; and sometimes it has occurred, that the very church or place where "feeling" would not have the judicatory meet, is the very place where it should meet.

But waiving all this, we protest that the Synod of Baltimore has no right to speak for the ministers and people of all the Border States. We do not claim to speak for the Synod of Kentucky, but we venture to say that the Assembly would be cordially welcomed within its bounds ; and if any persons who in form or heart adhere to the Presbyterian Church are, from "feeling" or otherwise, "decidedly against the holding of the Assembly in any of the Border States," we trust they will be brought to a better mind toward the supreme judicatory of their church, or seek ecclesiastical relations more congenial to their "feelings."

Washington, however, does not happen to be "in any of the Border States." We would like to know why it is that the Assembly may not meet in the capital of the nation, on ground common to all parties in the State, and certainly common to the church. Is it because the Assembly has become of late rather too patriotic in its utterances to suit Presbyterians in that locality ? We well know that there is a decided element of disloyalty in some of the churches of the Synod of Baltimore, including those within the District of Columbia ; but we hope, for the credit of our ministerial brethren at least, that there has been no such concession to disloyalty as to result in an understanding among them, prompted by the "feeling" intimated "decidedly" to exist, to keep the General Assembly out of their bounds. We are "decidedly" of the opinion that a visit of the Assembly would do good at the capital, for we know of no place in the country (and we claim to know something of Washington society), where sympathy with the rebellion is more deeply seated, active and demonstrative in some of its peculiar forms, than in that city, under the very shadow of the government, in the church and out of it, among those who are making more money out of the trade which the war has brought to their doors than they ever before dreamed of, as well as among those who bask in the sunshine of power, and whose families have been fed and clothed by the Government, through the emoluments of office, all their lives. If the reason for the "feeling" expressed "against the

holding of the Assembly" in Washington, springs out of or is a concession to the iniquitous sympathy with treason and rebellion which so pervades the capital of the Nation, we think there are strong grounds for believing that a visit of the Assembly there would be "decidedly" salutary.

CHURCH COMMENTARY.

This subject was brought before the General Assembly by Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, several years since. He submitted a plan upon which it was proposed that a complete commentary on the Holy Scriptures should be prepared and published under the supervision of the Assembly, to be conformed to the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church. The subject has been discussed in several assemblies, but no definite action has been taken further than to refer the matter to a committee, hear their report, continue the discussion, and postpone final action from year to year. An able report in favor of the project was made by Dr. E. T. Baird, on behalf of the committee, some two or three years since.

The subject came up in the last Assembly, and, on a motion for indefinite postponement, was again discussed by Drs. Blackwood, Delaney, Nevin, and Judge Clarke, against the motion and in favor of the commentary, and by Dr. Brownson and A. T. Rankin in favor of the motion; when, finally, the motion was lost, and the subject was referred to the next Assembly.

REVISED BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.

This is another subject which has been pending several years. Reports have been made upon it by able committees, or by a committee several times modified, and much discussion has ensued. It was taken up early in the late Assembly, and more progress was made than on any other similar occasion. The first seven chapters were considered during portions of several days, many amendments were made, and these chapters adopted. Among the final proceedings taken upon the subject, Mr. Goodale moved to refer the remaining portion of the Book, from the beginning of the eighth chapter, to the next Assembly. Judge Clarke stated that this was the unanimous desire of the committee. Dr. Humphrey offered an

amendment, requesting the next Assembly to make its consideration the first order for the second day of the session; and in this form the resolution passed.

It is not important, at the present stage of this business, to pass any judgment upon the labors of the Assembly. The amendments adopted are so numerous, many of them minute, some affecting great principles and others merely verbal, and withal, from the reports we have seen, some of the more important of the changes made by these amendments are presented with so much ambiguity, that we have by no means a clear view of what has been done. And then, furthermore, whatever the Assembly may have done, granting it all to be well done, no part of its work is decisive and final. After the next Assembly shall have gone entirely through with the revision of the remaining chapters, the whole must go down to the presbyteries. As the Book can not become law without adoption by the proper number, the Presbyteries may finally approve or condemn the whole.

And even now, although only the part beginning with the eighth chapter has been referred, the whole is open to discussion. We do not perceive, however, that the Assembly made any provision, as has been done two or three times before, to have the Book presented to the churches at large, in so far as it has now been adopted, that it might be open to general examination. Perhaps this is well. It may be best to have no further presentation of this sort, except what may be found in the official minutes when published, until the whole can be officially and formally sent down to the presbyteries, for their adoption or rejection.

SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE.

Dr. Loyal Young, chairman of the committee on this subject, submitted the following resolutions, which were adopted :

“*Resolved*, That the General Assembly re-enact the action of 1851, viz.: that the churches that have no fixed times for contributing to the Boards, be earnestly requested to take up annual collections as follows : For the Board of Domestic Missions on the first Sabbath of November ; for the Board of Foreign Missions, on the first Sabbath of January ; for the Board of Education, on the first Sabbath of March ; for the Colportage

Fund, on the first Sabbath of May; for the Board of Church Extension, on the first Sabbath of July; and for Disabled Ministers' Fund, on the first Sabbath of September.

Resolved, That, if it is inconvenient for any church to make the contributions on the days specified, they be requested to make them as soon thereafter as possible.

Resolved, That the secretaries of the several Boards be directed to transmit to the pastors and churches circulars a short time previous to the days named for making these contributions to each object, calling their attention to the subject.

Resolved, That no pastor does his full duty who fails to bring before his people annually all these objects of benevolence.

Resolved, That the ruling elders of the vacant churches be instructed to endeavor to secure annual collections for all these objects.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Board of Publication be directed to send to the stated clerks of the Presbyteries, blank forms of reports on Systematic Benevolence, and that it be enjoined on the stated clerks to report annually to the General Assembly."

PROFESSORS ELECTED.

The report from the Committee on Theological Seminaries presented the fact that there were three vacancies in the chairs of two of these institutions, viz.: the chair of Didactic and Pastoral Theology, in the Western Theological Seminary at Allegheny City, Pa., occasioned by the resignation of Rev. William S. Plumer, D. D.; and the chair of Didactic and Polemic Theology, and that of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in the Theological Seminary of the Northwest, the former occasioned by the resignation, several years since, of Rev. N. L. Rice, D. D., and the latter by the decease, in December, 1861, of the Rev. William M. Scott, D. D. The committee recommended that the first and last mentioned chairs should be filled by elections at this Assembly.

When this business came up for consideration, Dr. Beatty moved the time for these elections, and nominated for the vacant chair in Allegheny Seminary, Rev. Lyman Atwater, D. D., at present the Professor of Moral Science in the College of New Jersey, at Princeton. This nomination was warmly sustained by brief remarks from Dr. Humphrey, and others, all bearing testimony to the personal worth of Dr. Atwater, and to his eminent abilities, fitting him for the position

Judge Leavitt, of Cincinnati, nominated for the chair of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in the Seminary at Chicago, Rev. Charles Elliott, D. D., now Professor of the Greek Language and Literature in Miami University. This nomination was also sustained by the remarks of several members. Mr. Shields nominated for the chair in Allegheny Seminary, Rev. E. D. MacMaster, D. D., and accompanied his nomination with some highly complimentary remarks. Dr. Nevin nominated Rev. William Blackwood, D. D., of Philadelphia, for the Chicago Professorship, with a statement of his eminent qualifications for the position.

Before the time for the election came, Dr. Blackwood, who was a member of the Assembly, obtained permission to have his name withdrawn, and Rev. Charles Elliott, D. D., was then unanimously elected to the chair for which he had been nominated, receiving 158 votes, the whole number cast. Dr. Atwater, for the chair in Allegheny Seminary, received 156 votes; and Dr. MacMaster, for the same chair, 31 votes. Dr. Atwater was declared elected. Dr. MacMaster was not present at the Assembly.

REVISION OF THE HYMN BOOK.

An overture was presented from the Presbytery of Albany for a revision of the Hymn Book, now in use among our churches. This does not seem to have occasioned any lengthened discussion, but from the action taken we infer that the impression was general that some step looking to revision was demanded. The Committee on Bills and Overtures presented a report, from which we make the following extract:

“II. With reference to the overture from the Presbytery of Albany, which has been put into their hands, and to which the Board has yielded a qualified assent, subject to the decision of the Assembly, the committee recommend, that, inasmuch as uniformity in our Church Psalmody is highly desirable, any effort at improvement should be made by the whole church, and not by any section or single presbytery. And, inasmuch as the *Tunes* associated with our common devotional lyrics differ so widely in different parts of the country, and musical education and tastes are so diversified, it seems impossible, at present, to compose a book of music, of moderate size, which shall satisfy the whole church; therefore, the Assembly do not sanction the proposition of the Presby-

tery of Albany, to publish a Book of Hymns and Tunes, as requested by the Presbytery of Albany.

III. But, since this overture furnishes one of many indications that there is a growing desire, in all parts of the church, that our Psalmody should be enriched from the large stores of lyric poetry which have accumulated since our Hymn Book was compiled, we recommend that the Assembly appoint a committee to take this whole subject into consideration, and to report to the next Assembly what changes, if any, should be made in our present Book of Psalms and Hymns. Also, to consider the expediency of arranging portions of the Word of God in a form suitable for chanting in our congregations."

It appears from this report, that the Presbytery of Albany desired to publish a Book of Hymns and Tunes, under the sanction of the Board of Publication, with the approval of the Assembly. This would have given a *quasi* sanction by the Assembly. The report was adopted, and the declinature of the proposition was just. There is, however, a wide-spread impression that our Hymn Book needs revision. It is far inferior to several with which we are acquainted, and it might be greatly improved. We are among those who believe in progress being made in our church music, both in the poetry and the tunes used in our public worship. The Assembly appointed an able committee to act under the foregoing minute, and we trust they will take time and produce a Book worthy of the purpose for which it is needed.

The following are the names of the persons composing this committee: J. T. Backus, D. D., S. Irenæus Prime, D. D., H. A. Boardman, D. D., William Blackwood, D. D., N. C. Burt, D. D., E. P. Humphrey, D. D., Willis Lord, D. D., Geo. Potts, D. D., Charles W. Shields, D. D., William M. Paxton, D. D., Cyrus Dickson, D. D., C. Kennicott, Boston; David Keith, St. Louis; Charles N. Todd, Indianapolis; Robert Carter, New York.

RELATIVE AUTHORITY OF ELDERS AND TRUSTEES.

The Presbytery of Cincinnati requested the General Assembly to "define the respective rights of the trustees and session in their control of the edifice used for public worship, and to direct what steps should be taken in cases of disagreement or collision between them."

The Committee on Bills and Overtures presented the following report, which was adopted. The views here presented are so just and discriminating that we present the report entire. Where conflict of authority arises on this subject in any congregation, here will be found the true solution :

“ Where a church edifice is held by trustees, the legal title is vested in them, and having the title, the custody and care of the church follows to them for the uses and purposes for which they hold the trust.

These uses and purposes are the worship of God and the employment of such other means of spiritual improvement as may be consistent with the Scriptures and the order of the church, to which may be added congregational meetings for business relating to the church or corporation. By the constitution the session is charged with the supervision of the spiritual interests of the congregation, and this includes the right to direct and control the use of the building for the purpose of worship, as required or established by the special usage of the particular church or the Directory for Worship. This being the principal purpose of the trust, the trustees are bound to respect the wishes and action of the session as to the use and occupation of the house of worship. The session is the organ or agent through whom the trustees are informed how and when the church building is to be occupied, and the trustees have no right to refuse compliance with the action of the session in this regard. These are general principles applicable to all cases, except perhaps in some localities where special statutory enactments by authority may confer other rights and prescribe other principles.

But there are other purposes for which the use of the church edifice is sometimes desired, which, though they partake of a religious or an intellectual character, do not fall within the class of objects which are properly described as belonging to the worship of that congregation. The house may not be used for such purposes without the consent of the trustees. As the function to determine what is a proper use of the house is vested in the session, the trustees have no legal right to grant the use of the house for purposes which the session disapprove, and as the strict rights of those who are represented by the session to the use of the house, are limited to the worship of that congregation, the trustees are under no obligation to grant it for any other purpose. When the trustees grant the use of the house to others, contrary to the expressed wishes of the session, and as they suppose to the prejudice of the cause of religion and of that church, the proper appeal is first to the persons composing the congregation to whom the trustees are responsible—secondly, to the presbytery for their advice, and finally to the legal tribunals.”

BOARD OF CHURCH EXTENSION.

A brief abstract of the operations of this Board, as we learn from their published Annual Report, is as follows :

“The number of applications for aid put on file from April 1, 1862, to April 1, 1863, was seventy. These applications were from churches in the bounds of twenty-one synods, thirty-seven presbyteries, and fifteen States and Territories. These seventy churches ask for aid amounting in the aggregate to \$24,954.40, averaging \$356.49 each. Besides these new applications filed during the year, there were sixty-one previous applications calling for \$24,991.75 undisposed of April 1, 1862. The Board, therefore, had before it, during the twelve months under review, one hundred and thirty-one applications calling for nearly \$50,000. During the year, six applications asking for \$8,625 were declined chiefly for want of funds, and thirty-seven applications requesting aid to the amount of \$13,691.75 were stricken from the file, because they had not furnished the requisite information in the two years allowed for that purpose. There remained on file and undisposed of for want of the usual information, April 1, 1863, applications from thirty-two churches calling for \$12,750. During the year under review appropriations amounting to \$10,308.40 were made to forty-six churches in the bounds of seventeen Synods, thirty-one presbyteries, and sixteen States and Territories. The average amount appropriated to each of these forty-six churches was \$224.09. Appropriations amounting to \$625 were, during the year, withdrawn from five churches. To one of these, however, a new appropriation was soon after made. The names and localities of all these churches will be found in the appendix to this report.”

Dr. John M. Lowrie, of Fort Wayne, Indiana, chairman of the committee, to whom the report of this Board was referred, presented a report, embodying several resolutions, which we can not insert entire, but of which the following is the substance : The Annual Report is approved, and also the minutes of the Board, and the report is recommended to be published. The third resolution commends the economy with which the Board have conducted their work, “in view of the difficulties of the times.” The fourth calls attention to the gratifying fact that very many churches, in all parts of the country, have relieved themselves of debt. This is spoken of as “remarkably simultaneous,” and as calling for “gratitude

to God for his special favor;" and in answer to prayer. The second resolution is so important that we embody it in full :

2. "We call attention to the facts that more than two-thirds of our churches are still entirely delinquent in contributing to the funds of this Board ; that the small amounts given—less than ten churches reaching the sum of \$100—indicate that the merits of the cause are too little laid before our people ; and that the increased cost of building makes larger contributions more important than before. We recommend, therefore, that the presbyteries be directed to inquire at their fall meetings what churches have taken the collections enjoined by the Assembly for July, on behalf of the Board of Church Extension, and to urge a more general attention hereafter to the wants of this Board."

The report was sustained by remarks from Rev. Dr. Coe, Secretary of the Board, who was invited to address the Assembly ; and also by the Rev. Messrs. Hayes, of Baltimore, Brown, of Georgetown, D. C., Judge Clark, of Detroit, and others. Judge Clark thanked the Assembly for what they had done through the Board for the churches in Michigan. "There was a large infusion of Old School Presbyterian sentiment in his State, through the work in part of this Board ; and, although they discarded divisive action, they were in a better condition, by this agency, to advance and enlarge our bounds in that direction." After these addresses the report of the committee was adopted.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

We find, in the Annual Report, the following interesting statement concerning the work of this Board for the year past, in aiding by its benevolent labors to increase the number of the ministry :

"The following table exhibits the operation of the Board of Education in the department of candidates for the ministry :

The number of <i>new</i> candidates, received during the year, has been	38
The number received from the beginning (in 1819), - - -	3202
The whole number on the roll during the past year has been -	313
Of these latter there have been,	
In their Theological course, - - - - -	155
" Collegiate " - - - - -	125
" Academical " - - - - -	33
	<hr/> 313

The aggregate number of candidates during the year now closed is sixty-two below that of last year, but is almost up to the average aggregate of the past eleven years. For that period the average aggregate has been three hundred and ninety-eight, while for the year covered by the present report, the average has been three hundred and ninety and five-sixths. This is a result for which the Board feel that great gratitude is due to the Head of the Church."

Rev. Dr. Wines, of New York, presented the report upon this subject from the committee to whom had been referred the Annual Report of the Board. We present the first three resolutions of the committee's report entire :

"Resolved, 1. That the General Assembly recognize as matter of fervent gratitude to God, the fact that in the midst of civil war, and of the agitations, calamities, and financial pressure consequent thereupon, the Board of Education should not only have been able to meet promptly all current expenses, as they accrued, but also to liquidate a debt of more than \$4,000, and to accumulate a balance altogether of \$9,283.41, of which amount nearly one-half is to the credit of the Ministerial Education Fund ; and the Assembly hereby records its approval of the diligence, zeal, and wisdom with which the Board and the Executive Committee have discharged the duties of their position.

Resolved, 2. That the General Assembly has noticed with a concern proportioned to its deep and far-reaching significance, the alarming decrease in the number of candidates offering for the gospel ministry, and exhort that earnest prayer be made of the church continually that the Lord of the harvest will multiply and send forth laborers into the harvest.

Resolved, 3. That the General Assembly concur with the Board in urging upon all ecclesiastical bodies having academical institutions under their control, that they use the most strenuous endeavors to elevate the standard of academic culture, and to make such culture broad, thorough, and every way worthy, both of the past history and of the future exigencies of the Presbyterian Church."

Rev. Dr. Chester, Corresponding Secretary, addressed the Assembly at great length, reviewing the operations of the Board during the past year. He said, "the number of young men taken from their studies for the ministry, who had enlisted under the banner of their country, was larger than the members of the Assembly were aware." He referred to the "large number of ministers unemployed," and said, "if

their history were traced, it could be shown they were never under the influence of the Board." After Dr. Chester's address, the report of the committee was adopted.

We would say nothing to injure this Board, but everything to aid it, for we regard it as one of the most important agencies of the church. Nor would we say a word to the disparagement of so good a man as Dr. Chester. We do not see, however, how it is, that coming "under the influence of this Board"—which we take to mean, being a beneficiary thereof, as a candidate—secures a man from ever being found in the ranks of "ministers unemployed." We have never supposed it among the powers of the Board to insure against that misfortune. We have known instances to the contrary. Dr. Chester is over sanguine, or he has not been correctly reported.

The resolutions present matter for very thoughtful and prayerful consideration. The first exhibits a state of things apparently cheering, and the Assembly, led by the committee, deem the condition of the finances such as to call for "fervent gratitude to God." But it admits of a doubt, or rather it seems highly probable, that the facts prompting to "gratitude" concerning the funds of the Board, grow out of that other condition of things mentioned in the second resolution, which is justly regarded with "concern," and which should humble the church, as this latter state of facts is occasioned by the judgments of God which have prompted the course of many candidates, for a time at least, in leaving their studies for the army, as intimated by Dr. Chester. We have an overflowing treasury *because* of the "alarming decrease" in the number of candidates. This we regard rather as an occasion of sorrow than of gratitude. The recommendation of the third resolution we must heartily indorse.

BOARD OF DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

We have space only for the following account of the operations of this Board for the year:

"The whole number of missionaries in commission since March 1, 1862, is 409. The number of churches and missionary stations in whole or part supplied (so far as reported) by those holding commission, is 676. Twenty churches are reported as having been organized during the

missionary year. The number of admissions on examination is 1242, and on certificate 777 ; a total of 2019. The whole membership in churches connected with the Board, is 17,755. Sabbath schools number 279, with 2453 teachers, and 16,680 scholars. The number of baptisms reported is 2105. As almost one-fourth in commission have not reported, the returns are manifestly inadequate, and do not express the facts ; and in this connection, the Board would suggest to the Assembly that this is an annual complaint ; and the purpose in asking for these detailed reports is nullified, and the view is not what your body would seek for in requiring this yearly exhibit from the Board. Pains are taken to send, in ample season, blanks, which can be readily filled up, and which we respectfully ask the brethren to transmit in season to the office. What remedy may be required, we leave to the wisdom of the Assembly."

The discussion upon the affairs of this important subject was interesting, and we present some selections from it. Dr. Janeway, Corresponding Secretary, was invited to address the Assembly :

" Dr. Janeway gave a brief account of the operations of the Board. The amount contributed last year to the support of the Board was \$72,000. This had been insufficient for the successful carrying-on of the work, and the consequences were that the Board is losing ground. The arrivals of foreign emigrants at the city of New York alone during the last week averaged 1,000 per day. In view of this he deemed it necessary that some action should be taken to make the collections large enough to enable the Board to keep abreast with the large tide of immigration, and maintain their rank in this work with the other churches of the country."

The report from the Committee on the Annual Report of the Board, was read by the Chairman, Rev. Dr. McFarren. We give but two resolutions from it, as follows :

" *Resolved*, 2. That the Assembly feel themselves called upon to give thanks to God, for having put it into the hearts of his people to furnish the Board with the means of liquidating the debt incurred in former years, which amounted, at the commencement of the year which has now closed, to something like \$5,000, retaining in the treasury a balance with which to commence the operations of the current year.

Resolved, 3. That it would have been still more satisfactory, if this result could have been achieved by increased contributions from the churches, instead of continuing the reduction of the scanty allowance to missionaries, and avoiding new fields. We regret to learn from this

Report, that, instead of increase, there was considerable falling off in the amount received from the churches, as compared with the year preceding. The Board acted wisely, we have no doubt, in making the liquidation of the debt an object of primary concern; but we can find no apology for the churches withholding, in a year of so much pecuniary prosperity, the means which were needed for the vigorous prosecution and extension of the work."

The discussion then proceeded as follows:

"Rev. R. A. Delancy called for the reading of the second section of the report, after which he stated that he felt a peculiar sympathy in this work. If God had gifted him with the silver-tongued eloquence of some of the brethren he would impress with all his power, upon the lay members of this Assembly, the importance of returning to their homes, and entering upon this work with their whole hearts, giving to Dr. Janeway a replenished treasury, so that he might go on as the work demanded. The Domestic Mission Board should be developed to the extent of the utmost resources and ability of the Church. It should be vitalized, supported and fostered with all the power of its right arm. Wherever you planted a home church, you established another contributor to the foreign fund. He referred to his last attendance upon his synod in the sunny South, on which occasion he had traveled four hundred miles down the valley of the Red River to Port Hudson, passing in the whole route within sight of but one church, and not one school house. And this was through one of the most fertile regions of this country. This single church was on the banks of the river at Alexandria, the place lately occupied by General Banks. He had also recently preached in a log cabin, away in the wilds of the Southwest, with two pine slabs for an altar, and the wild winds sweeping through the chinks of the logs. He supposed that three-fourths of the churches of our denomination in the South are closed, in which the voice of prayer and melody is no more heard. He held a letter from a pastor in the South, who had received no salary for two years, and whose family suffered for the necessities of life; and this was the case with many who had now no means of support at all. The Synod of Texas covers more territory than the six New England States, and New York, Ohio, and Indiana. Twenty-nine missionaries only were in that synod. No one knows aught about the desolation of the South. The question is all summed up in this—there is not room for two Anglo-American Protestant nations between the Lakes and the Gulf. The question then is—Washington or Richmond. And when we have conquered those men of the South, their feebleness will throw them upon the church. And what will be the responsibilities of this mission when four millions of

the dusky sons of sorrow in the South will, by this action, have their claims upon it. He would like to offer a resolution that the Assembly say to the Secretary of the Board, we will double your income, and make it \$150,000.

The appeal of Mr. Delancy was earnest and deeply impressive, and secured the undivided attention of the Assembly.

Rev. Mr. Scott, of California, by request, presented a few facts in regard to affairs in California. He had been repeatedly asked if there were any vacancies in California. He had replied there were none. Ministers who went to that State would have to follow his example. He first went to Arcada at Humboldt Bay. There he preached two Sundays, when an effort was made to raise funds for his support one year. \$1,200 were obtained. He concluded this was the place for him. Three months later, \$1,400 were subscribed to build a church, and the work commenced. Now they were out of debt, and the church in a flourishing condition. This is the fact in regard to that State. There are no vacancies, but there are plenty of Humboldt Bays. From the report of the Board, there are only six missionaries in this large State, only five of whom obtained aid from the Board. There were sixty-nine in Pennsylvania. He thought this should be reversed. There are thousands in California who had not heard a sermon for years. The people of California, as a mass, are intelligent, and a preacher who goes there must know something. Such a one will be kindly received, and well supported. The principal trouble in sending missionaries there is the cost of transit, but he had no doubt if many were sent the majority would be able to support themselves.

Rev. Mr. Spear—It is proper that each should give some reports of the destitutions of the field he occupies. The speaker represented the extreme Northwest—particularly Minnesota. The country has been settled with unusual rapidity, with a large population, who have sought a healthy country. It will always be a resort for that large class of immigrants. There is then a large proportion there of American born citizens of unusual intelligence. But Mr. Spear would direct special attention to the Scandinavian population of that country. Other churches have shown great interest in this land, and have met with much success. If we do not send the gospel to the Upper Mississippi, others will, and will gather the families of Presbyterians. It is, however, entirely a missionary field.

Rev. Mr. Osmond feared the impression would be left upon the minds of the Assembly that too much attention had been paid to the missionary work in the East. To correct such an impression, he briefly reviewed that work with the urgent necessities constantly calling for it.

Rev. Mr. Giltner, from Nebraska City, narrated the progress of the

work in the far West, and the difficulties the missionaries were there obliged to encounter. Where do your brothers and your children go when they leave their eastern homes in the spread of civilization toward the setting sun? Will you deprive these of the means of obtaining the Gospel of Christ? The Presbytery of Missouri River takes in all the territory of Nebraska. The workers there are all missionaries, but they are much discouraged in their work. They have prayed, but in vain, for more workers in that region. There are many important fields in their Presbytery which can not be occupied, for their applications for aid meet with the answer that there are not funds sufficient. One most important point is near the Omaha Reservation, where the influence of the mission upon the Indians would also have a great effect upon the white population. A large German population, too, was constantly flowing into that section. Large numbers of foreign Mormon emigrants, meeting with disappointments at Salt Lake, were constantly returning to the border within the limits of his Presbytery, and some of the most valued members of his church were from this same class.

Rev. Mr. Benedict, of Connecticut, wished to be indulged for a moment while he spoke for the East. They were destitute, even in Connecticut. In some places they had not ministers to bury their dead. He had been told in one section that they had not heard a sermon in six weeks. In regarding the South, the West and the North, they should not forget the claims of the East.

The Moderator called Dr. Beatty to the chair, stating that he wished to call attention to a matter which had not yet been alluded to. He thought the presbyteries should be more careful in recommending churches for aid. Many were now seeking assistance from the Board, who were perfectly able to support themselves. He himself had seen churches applying for aid who should be ashamed of it. This was wrong, as it deprived many, who absolutely needed it, of assistance."

After this discussion, the report of the committee was adopted.

BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The Annual Report on this subject was referred to a committee, of which Rev. Dr. Nevin, of Philadelphia, was chairman. The report presented by him was discussed at length, and adopted.

Our two Boards of Missions, domestic and foreign, exhibit, in their yearly work, so much of the practical labors of the church in spreading the gospel at home and abroad, that we

deem it proper to give more space to a consideration of their operations than to those of some of the other Boards. Hence, we present the material part of the discussion upon Foreign Missions before the Assembly, as we have done that on Domestic Missions. We make selections from what appear to be the best reports which have come into our hands.

Dr. John C. Lowrie, one of the Corresponding Secretaries of the Board, after the reading of the report, was invited to address the Assembly:

"Dr. Lowrie reviewed at considerable length the operations of the Board, and the difficulties under which they had labored. He urged particularly the necessity of enlarging all the missions. Those already established are now in a prosperous condition, but a large increase to the funds of the Board will be needed during the coming year.

Mr. Robert Carter then addressed the Assembly in regard to the financial condition of the Mission. He had always felt great interest in this work of Foreign Missions. More than a quarter of a century ago he had bid farewell to the present venerable Moderator, then a dark haired young man with his partner at his side, and had presented him a copy of the Bible. Now he stands before us, with the weight of years upon him, a representative of a far-off land. He could not trust his feelings in dwelling upon such matters but would pass to consider the unprecedented rise of exchange on foreign remittances, which had greatly increased the cost of supporting the Missions, and threatened great injury to the cause. No less than \$26,500 had been paid for exchange during the past year above what was formerly required, and \$24,000 more would be needed prior to the first of October. He urged upon the churches more particular attention to the missionary work.

Rev. J. H. Morrison, Moderator of the Assembly, followed. He entered into a detailed account of the condition of the missions in India, in which he had labored long. He stated that the Foreign Mission work had for the past few years been rapidly going backward. For ten missionaries who had permanently returned from the work, only four had gone out, and there is now but one effective agent at each station. The mission at Lahore had not received a single missionary since 1855. And it had already been voted to recommend the Board to relinquish this station, that the remainder might be strengthened. The retrograde movement has long been going on. The appeals of the missionaries have been in vain. The General Assembly was last year warned of this, and unless attention is paid to these appeals, and more missionaries are sent, other stations must be given up. The labors now imposed upon members

of the mission are far greater than they should be called to bear. But little encouragement is given them in their work, and they can not but feel that they are being forgotten at home. This is cruel and unjust. He referred to the diminished condition of missionary periodicals, and the little interest manifested in them. 20,000 copies of the *Foreign Missionary* were printed, and one copy circulated, it is said, in each family in the church. These are distributed in the churches, where large numbers of them are left until the sexton takes them for waste paper. The church sends missionaries abroad telling them to labor, and suffer what the Lord may call upon them to bear, but 'never let us hear from you.' The speaker made a most urgent appeal on behalf of the cause. This was the last time he should probably ever address this Assembly. He was about returning to the field in which he had labored for twenty-five years, to give the remainder of his energies to the noble work.

Mr. Conger then offered the following resolution :

Resolved, That relying for support in this our declaration upon the great Head of the Church, we humbly call upon our Board of Missions to go forward, and pledge ourselves to urge immediate action in this matter upon our respective presbyteries, and to renewed efforts in bringing our churches to a more efficient co-operation in this noble work.

Dr. Beatty felt a deep interest in this cause. When a youth he had offered himself as a foreign missionary, but the Board to which he applied, could not send him. Subsequently when in middle life the subject had again come before him, and he was willing to go but Providence hedged up his way. The next best thing he could do he did, and trained an adopted son for the work. That son in the gospel was now in the field and the oldest missionary of our Board. We need more of the missionary spirit.

Rev. Mr. Spear, a returned missionary, narrated at some length the trials and difficulties of a missionary's life. Few could realize the exhausting character of the work. Much time was necessarily lost in studying the languages, from ill health and other causes. The number of missionaries must be increased, and the fund largely augmented, to meet the expenses of apparatus and other appliances so necessary to the work.

The report of the committee was then adopted, after which Mr. McCoubry moved that the resolution of Mr. Conger should be adopted by a rising vote, and that the Moderator should call upon some member to lead in prayer, imploring the divine assistance in enabling those who should vote for it to maintain their pledge. The resolution having been read by the clerk and adopted by a standing vote, Rev. John Fleming, in behalf of the voters, offered a fervent supplication for divine aid in consecrating themselves anew to the service of their Master, and impressing upon their people the importance of the missionary work. He

earnestly sought the divine blessing upon those who were now laboring in heathen lands, that their hands might be strengthened in their labors and that new missionaries with their hearts deeply imbued with the greatness of their mission, should be sent forth to the harvest now ready for the reaper.

Dr. Goodale then offered the following, prefacing it with a few remarks. He thought it would yield an annual revenue of \$50,000 :

Resolved, That our pastors and superintendents be urged to endeavor to secure from all of our Sabbath schools a contribution equal to at least one cent per week for each scholar."

SUPPORT OF DISABLED MINISTERS.

This important subject appears to be receiving more and more the attention of the church from year to year. Rev. A. T. Rankin, from the committee, presented the report, from which we select the following resolutions, adopted by the Assembly, with portions of the discussion :

Resolved, 3. That in view of the success and favorable acceptance of the plan recommended by the Assembly of 1849, and sanctioned by several subsequent Assemblies, this Assembly re-affirm said action, and recommend that annual collections be solicited in all the churches for current expenditures; and also that large donations and bequests be solicited to form gradually a permanent fund, the interest of which shall be pledged in aid of the objects indicated.

Resolved, 4. That the report be appended to the Minutes of this Assembly, and be printed by the Board of Publication, a copy of which shall be sent to each pastor, with a request that it be read to his congregation.

Resolved, 5. That if the sums contributed by the Church in any year exceed the sum needed to meet the demand upon it, the Trustees be authorized to invest such surplus as a part of the Permanent Fund in such way as that it shall be safe and productive.

Judge Leavitt moved the adoption of the report and begged leave to make a few remarks. There was no necessity to speak in vindication of this fund. He asked to be heard on two grounds: 1. He had had a connection with this subject for some years. 2. Ministers may feel some delicacy in speaking on this subject, and therefore a few words from a ruling elder might be acceptable. He thought that the present method of raising funds had proved itself to be the best under the present circumstances. The policy of a permanent fund of a large amount he thought unwise and impracticable. The committee appointed by the last Assembly on this subject had not been called together, and he supposed

the policy was abandoned. Judge Leavitt also spoke of the generous gifts by which the officers of this fund were supported, and the gifts of a few individuals.

He was supported by T. McKenman, Esq., of Washington, Pennsylvania, who called on the members of this Assembly, and especially the lay members, to take the deepest interest in this work, and to give their best efforts to the support of so worthy a cause. Other churches had long since made arrangements for the support of their superannuated ministers, while it was only within a few years that the Presbyterian Church had made any movement in the matter. He had known cases where the widows of deceased pastors had been obliged to sell the libraries of their husbands for support. Ministers are too delicate and negligent in bringing this matter before their people. He hoped all members would appreciate the importance of the work.

Rev. Mr. Lee—The question is, Are there any who need the support of this fund? The report says there are. So every minister can testify. When the speaker was a boy, he knew an aged minister who had spent a useful and stainless life. He was reported to be in great distress, and he was sent as an almoner, and found him without a crust. But this benevolence was merely voluntary and limited, and this fund is to be permanent and general. The speaker referred to the current prejudice against old pastors, and the relief which is given to such aged servants is invaluable; they are Christ's poor.

Rev. L. E. Baker preferred annual collections to the plan of a permanent fund. He was opposed to anything that would relieve the churches from this collection.

Rev. G. S. Plunley thought the laymen and the younger ministers particularly should labor to advance this cause. He also was opposed to a permanent fund formed by collections, but a fund of this kind might be raised by bequests and donations.

Mr. Geo. Junkin, Jr., spoke of the difficulties the committee had to contend with. Interferences were constantly being made, under the plea of substituting something better. The plan of the committee is good and should be sustained. The ministers should be sustained both while able to labor and when they have become disabled. He hoped the whole of the report would be received, with the amendment that ministers be required to read it in every church. It would do great good. Ministers often felt a delicacy in bringing this matter before their people, but if the Assembly made an *injunction*, they would be relieved of this embarrassment. Mr. Junkin's brief but eloquent remarks were listened to with profound attention.

Dr. J. M. Lowrie opposed a *requirement* upon the ministers making it necessary to read any report. He strongly opposed the plan of adducing

extreme cases as a specimen of the general treatment of ministers of our churches.

Dr. Nevin hoped it would be passed. He further said that if this fund is not supported, there would be great secularization of the ministry. He admitted that isolated and extreme cases should not be adduced as proofs of a general rule. He hoped that the ruling elders would persist in their support of this noble cause."

BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

We give the following abstract of some of the operations of this Board, taken from their Annual Report as presented to the General Assembly:

"The Board has issued during the year,

	COPIES.
5 new books, of which have been printed - - -	10,000
3 new tracts, - - - - -	24,000
1 package of 21 soldiers' tracts, - - - - -	3,000
1 hospital card, - - - - -	20,000
2 packages of leaflets, - - - - -	6,000
2 German books, - - - - -	700

Total copies of new publications, 63,700

The reprints of former publications during the year have been,

Of books, - - - - -	226,000
Of tracts, - - - - -	253,000
Of packages of tracts, - - - - -	17,000—496,000

Total number of publications during the year, 559,700

Total number of copies of books and tracts issued by the

Board since its organization, 10,790,488

In addition to the above there have been printed during the year,

Of Sabbath School Visitor, - - -	676,000
Of the Home and Foreign Record, - - -	126,000
Of the Annual Report of the Board, - - -	4,000

And by order of the General Assembly:

Of the Revised Book of Discipline, - - -	3,000
Of the Report of the Disabled Ministers' Fund, - - -	2,000
Of the Report on Systematic Benevolence, - - -	3,000

Bringing together the various items of distribution, which have above been given separately, the aggregate will be as follows:

Volumes sold at the Depository, - - - - - 175,019

	COPIES.
Volumes sold by Colporteurs, - - -	43,947
Volumes given by Colporteurs, - - -	72,299
Volumes granted by Executive Committee, - -	26,950

Total of volumes distributed,	318,215
Increase over last year, - - - -	78,281

The pages of tracts distributed are as follows :

By sale at the Depository, - - - -	570,461
Gratuitously by Colporteurs, - - - -	2,399,030
Granted by Executive Committee, - - -	683,968

Total, - - - -	3,653,459
Less than last year, - - - -	731,679

In addition to these, the Board has issued,

Copies of the Sunday School Visitor, - - -	676,000
“ “ Home and Foreign Record, - - -	126,000
“ of various Reports, - - - -	12,000

Besides Sessional Minutes and Registers, Forms for Systematic Benevolence, Sabbath-school class-books, Sabbath-school tickets, Sheet hymns, Hospital cards, etc., etc., in great numbers.

The *net value* of these issues of the year is as follows :

Sales in the Depository, - - - -	\$25,889.15
Sent to Seminaries, Authors, Editors, etc., - -	338.87
Sales by Colporteurs, - - - -	20,493.02
Home and Foreign Record, - - - -	3,864.19
Sabbath School Visitor, - - - -	5,502.51

Total of net value,	\$56,087.74
---------------------	-------------

INVESTIGATION OF THE AFFAIRS OF THE BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

For several years past, in successive General Assemblies, complaints have been made against some of the Boards. The Board of Education, we believe, was the first whose operations were severely criticised before the General Assembly. This was many years ago. The amiable and pure character of its chief secretary, the lamented Dr. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer, was deemed by many a sufficient guaranty that its affairs were managed prudently. A radical difference of opinion existed regarding the principles adopted by the Board, by which schools of all grades were taken under the super-

vision of the Church. But the complaints against this Board have long since died away, either from a general acquiescence in its management, or from being drowned in the louder clamor which has since been raised against certain other Boards. We believe these complaints never culminated in the appointment of a committee by the General Assembly to investigate the affairs of the Board of Education.

The Boards of Domestic Missions and of Publication have not come off so easily. In several successive Assemblies strong and denunciatory speeches were made against both of them, while they ran the gauntlet in parallel lines. This was especially the case, as many who were present remember, at the Assembly of 1859, at Indianapolis. The action of these Boards was defended ably by their respective secretaries, Dr. Musgrave appearing for the Board of Domestic Missions, and Dr. Schenck for that of Publication. A committee was finally appointed to investigate and report upon the affairs of the former Board. The result has been, that some changes have been made, Drs. Musgrave and Happersett resigned their secretaryships, Dr. Thomas L. Janeway is now the Secretary, and under his efficient management the Board has been doing its work for two or three years, entirely to the satisfaction of the Church, so far as we know, and "the churches have had rest" from this disturbing element in the General Assembly.

The trials of the Board of Publication lingered longer. It was annually made the subject of criticism in each Assembly up to that of 1862, when an able committee was appointed "to make a thorough investigation of the affairs of the Board of Publication, and report to the next General Assembly." This committee consisted of Rev. Drs. Beatty, McPheeters, Atwater, J. M. Lowrie and Paxton, and Elders Leavitt, Donaldson, Crosby and Whitely. This committee was directed to meet in Philadelphia, and make a personal and "thorough examination of the affairs of the Board;" the Board was directed to give them all needed facilities "in carrying out the objects of their appointment;" and "all persons from any part of the church" were to "have full opportunity," and were "requested, either in person or by writing, to present to the committee any objections or doubts they may entertain in regard to the plans and operations of the Board;" and the

Board were "directed to pay the traveling and other expenses of the members of this committee from its treasury."

The committee met as directed, made their investigation, and presented to the late Assembly the result of their work in an elaborate report, the material portions of which, from the importance of the matters brought out, and the interest the church at large takes in the subject, we deem it best to lay before the reader.

"Dr. Beatty, from the committee, read from the Minutes of the last Assembly the manner of appointment of this committee. He said the work they had accomplished to the best of their ability, and he now called upon Dr. Lowrie, secretary of the committee, to read their report.

The main points in the report are as follows :

1. Complaints from various quarters, chiefly from individuals, were received by the committee.

2. Facilities were given by the Board, and all its officers, for the investigation.

3. The first matter of investigation was into the character of the publications of the Board.

The various *criteria* by which to judge of these publications are : 1. Orthodoxy. 2. Adaptation to the wants of the Church. 3. The actual sales secured by these publications. 4. Attractiveness in style and appearance. In all these respects, the publications of the Board are thought to be worthy of approval.

4. *Financial Operations and the Capital of the Board.* The capital is \$237,000. This can be used actively only for about \$160,000. The average annual profit for thirteen years is six and four-fifths per cent. The salaries of officers may be retrenched. Under this head the following recommendations were made : 1. That the salary of the Corresponding Secretary be unchanged ; but that he be made the Editor of the Board. 2. That the office of the Treasurer and Superintendent be combined. 3. That the duties of the Publishing Agent be assigned to the Superintendent of Depository, without any increase of salary. 4. That the office and salary of Solicitor be discontinued. 5. That a bookkeeper be continued as at present with the same salary.

The question arises, should the Board do all its work of printing and publishing? After examination and consideration, the committee do not think it wise or necessary at the present time. No censure is made by the committee on this part of the subject.

5. *The General Efficiency of the Management of the Board.* The Committee made an examination into the work of the last thirteen years, and submitted the following table :

Years.	Total Capital.	Estimated Capital, exclusive of Real Estate, Plates, etc.	Sales.	Salaries.	Expenses.	Profits.	Profits per cent.			Per cent. Expenses on Sales.
							On Capital.	Active Capital.	On Sales.	
1849	\$84,054	\$50,000	\$39,454	\$6,229	\$2,050	\$2,999	3.5	5.	7.6	23.2
1850	109,689	63,000	58,644	6,595	2,515	9,314	8.5	14.8	15.9	15.5
1851	119,603	69,000	59,457	7,992	2,570	12,086	10.1	17.5	20.3	17.8
1852	137,084	76,000	70,968	7,350	2,914	14,132	10.3	18.6	20.	13.4
1853	151,221	86,000	77,648	10,193	2,880	17,980	11.9	21.	23.1	17.
1854	160,402	100,000	65,793	11,182	3,254	7,353	4.2	7.25	11.	21.8
1855	176,455	113,000	65,341	11,342	2,949	11,186	6.3	10.8	17.1	21.8
1856	187,641	108,000	81,055	12,723	3,766	11,957	6.3	11.	14.7	20.26
1857	199,578	112,000	73,811	13,071	3,937	12,231	6.1	10.9	16.5	23.
1858	211,609	118,000	69,087	14,075	3,705	5,463	2.6	4.6	7.9	25.7
1859	217,272	120,000	80,933	14,180	3,539	12,161	5.5	10.	15.	21.8
1860	229,453	130,000	81,849	15,397	4,762	13,154	5.7	10.	16.	24.6
1861	242,587	140,000	31,031	13,660	3,036	-5,200	-2.			54.6
1862	237,387	135,000								

* Donated for building purposes.

Having before said that the average of profits on the entire capital was 6.8 per cent., we now add that the average per cent. of profits on the active capital as estimated, is 11.9: the average per cent. cost of salaries on average sales is 16.4; the average per cent. of total expenses on average sales is 21.3: and the average per cent. of profits above expenses on average sales is 17.5.

The committee here considered the operations of the Board as business operations and benevolent operations. The Board was not intended to be simply a business concern. But the benevolent operations must not be hindrances to the extension of the trade of the Board. In regard to the general operations, the work of the Board may compare favorably with any other institution of the same kind. Bad debts only amount to seventy dollars per annum.

Another question is, can not the sphere of the Board be enlarged, and its operations made even more efficient? Depositories, the committee concluded, were not the means to enlarge the efficient operations of the Board. The control of the business should not be given to one person, and a proposition made to the Board was wisely declined.

Recommendations.—1. Books for Sabbath school libraries should be multiplied. 2. A more liberal discount should be given to one good bookseller in every large city. 3. That the Board should sell entire editions of works to other publishers, with their imprint.

6. *Colportage.*—This is an important branch of the Board's work. The committee was urged to consider this as merely a business matter. Some think that all denominational efforts of this kind should cease. The committee dissent from both these opinions. They think too much money has been spent in salaries of District Superintendents. It is true

that the Assembly has indorsed this ; but the committee think the sum might be diminished.

7. *Periodicals of the Board*.—Little need be said about the *Home and Foreign Record*, as all the Boards are concerned in this. The *Sabbath School Visitor* is worthy of support. Its cost should be reduced.

On motion of Dr. Nevin, a vote of thanks was tendered the committee for the diligence and fidelity with which they had performed their duties."

The foregoing report of the Investigating Committee was referred to the Committee on the Annual Report of the Board of Publication. On behalf of this committee, Rev. Dr. Hickok presented a report embracing eleven resolutions, a synopsis of which we here give, with the discussion which followed.

"While the committee disapprove of the proposal of the Presbytery of Albany in regard to a hymn book they offer the following: 1. Discontinue the office of Editor and assign his duties to the Corresponding Secretary. 2. Continue salary of the latter except his life insurance. 3. Transfer duties of Treasurer to Superintendent of Colportages. 4. Transfer duties of Publishing Agent to Superintendent of Depository. 5. Discontinue office of Solicitor and continue that of Bookkeeper. 6. Put the Periodical Department under one man with a salary of \$1,300, and that he employ his own clerks, etc. 7. Require a full report every year from the Board, Executive Committee, etc. 8. Discontinue the addition of six per cent. to the capital and enjoin upon the Board to conform as far as possible to the recommendations of the special committee on the subject of profits, etc. 9. Assign the subject of the preparation of a hymn book to a committee to report to the next Assembly. 10. Discontinue payments for contribution to the Visitor. 11. Publish the report of the Special Committee in the report of the Board and Appendix to the Minutes.

Dr. Schenck, Secretary of the Board, then addressed the Assembly in reference to the present condition of the Board and its operations during the past year. His remarks were chiefly confined to three points. 1. There had been a considerable diminution this year in the receipts. 2. There had been fewer books purchased this year. 3. The increased cost of materials. The Board had latterly published fewer new books and more issues of old books. Many colporteurs had accepted other employment, but a large number had volunteered in this service. He referred to the vast army and navy in the field. He thought half a million of our brave soldiers and sailors had been supplied more or less

with our books. Not one officer or chaplain had ever been refused books. He referred to the great influence of the Soldier's Pocket Book. He complimented the report of the Special Committee and would cheerfully submit to any action of the Assembly but would desire permission to express doubts in regard to the propriety of dispensing with the services of Dr. Engles, the Editor of the Board.

The discussion was continued by Dr. Lowrie, who had the floor at the close of the morning session. After claiming for himself the most friendly relations with Dr. Engles, he presented in a kind and conciliating manner several urgent reasons for a discontinuance of his office. His remarks were listened to with marked attention, and evidently had great weight with the Assembly.

The proposition to unite the offices was opposed strongly on the grounds of its impracticability and the strong claims of the present editor from his long service in the church. The principal arguments in its favor were its feasibility and the necessity upon the score of economy.

Dr. Sheddan thought Dr. Engles ought not to be ousted. It was a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy.

Mr. Delancy moved to amend by adding 'when his office becomes vacant.' Lost.

Dr. Blackwood opposed erasing Dr. Engles' name with great earnestness.

Dr. A. Nevin said that the matter was one of great delicacy, and any more against the Board must be made under proscription. The committee acted fairly. I did not go to the committee myself. Things have been done in my absence from the Board, on the plea of delicacy. I have tried to reform these things. Dr. Schenck is the Editor of the Board but technically. Dr. Engles is not the Editor. The salaries of the officers of the Board are too large. I hope that delicacy will not interfere with justice.

Mr. G. Junkin, Jr., would not follow in the spirit of the last speech. It did not deserve reply. The spirit of the speech was easily discernible. He was in favor of striking out the whole resolution, and made this motion.

Dr. Beatty, as Chairman of the Committee, explained the reason of this resolution. The reduction of the expenses of the Board has been a subject of discussion for years. Dr. Engles has received this salary for many years. He did not think that the labor was too much to be added to the Secretary of the Board. But the Assembly must judge for themselves. Of late the duties have not been very large or onerous.

Mr. Mott thought the Assembly was approaching a subject which might be of great danger. Gray hairs are not respected as they should be, and have been. Dr. Engles has served this church even down to

old age, and my soul revolts against this stigma of age. There is a principle at stake. This is a false move and a false economy. We propose to save twelve hundred dollars. The Board is beginning to move again in publishing. The duties are heavy and growing. There is an economy that defeats itself, and will end, I fear, in a carelessness in our publications for want of time. There is nothing deserving more wisdom, care, and prudence than this matter of supervising the publications of our church.

Mr. Mecklin opposed the last speaker, and thought that sympathy for the Editor should not be allowed its influence here.

Rev. Dr. Lowrie, of Indiana, followed. This was the action of the committee in deliberate and united council. The salary of the Editor has varied in different years. The work of rejection is not so large as might be thought. It is not necessary to read a whole book in order to know that it is not fit for publication. Dr. Engles has not confined his labors entirely to this work. I have not conferred in this matter with Dr. Engles, but all our relations have been most cordial. This is a public matter, and we should be careful in the use of those contributions which come up from the church. I give all due honor to Dr. Engles' position and labors. I only desire to vindicate the action of the committee on this point."

The discussion was continued at great length, and the report was finally adopted, retaining the chief modifications in the organization of the Board which the committee had recommended. This brought forth the following protest, which was admitted to record:

"The undersigned hereby respectfully dissent from the action of the General Assembly by which the Board of Publication are restrained from the further accumulation of active capital to be employed in their operations, because

1. The capacity to serve the church efficiently by the operations of this Board depends in a great degree upon the amount of capital employed, and therefore the increase of capital ought to be commensurate with the growth of the church. To stop accumulation of capital implies either that no further growth of the church is expected, or else that such increase of membership is to be denied the advantages of this Board.

2. The questions determined by this act of the Assembly involve very complicated considerations not truly of a commercial character, but the relations of a publishing house to a system of colportage, which we believe may be more satisfactorily settled by such a Board of wise and

prudent Christian men as compose the Board of Publication of this church, than they can be by this Assembly during the brief period which it can bestow upon the consideration of them.

Signed by—H. K. Clark, Geo. Junkin, Jr., Wm. Blackburn, Thomas McKennan, J. H. M. Knox, Wm. D. Sinclair, A. D. White, D. Cook, S. E. Wier, Robert S. Manning, E. B. Fuller, A. T. Rankin, Thos. M. Gray, Chas. Hubbard, C. W. Stewart, W. E. Westervelt, J. S. Hellenstein, E. C. Wines, G. W. Lewis, G. S. Plumley, H. P. S. Willis, G. S. Inglis, J. A. Quarles, H. B. Thayer, E. E. Rankin, John Mack, L. C. Baker."

We do not feel competent to pass a perfectly confident judgment upon this entire action of the General Assembly, resulting in such serious changes in one of the great organic agencies of the church; for the matters are somewhat complicated, some of them are of a purely business and financial nature, and all of them require the most careful examination and thorough acquaintance, personal if possible, in order to render a judgment of much value. We will barely indicate a few things which appear obvious.

1. There seems to have been a disposition, for years past, to carp at the Boards of the church, at the meetings of the General Assembly. This has sometimes manifested itself in opposition to their existence altogether, but more frequently to the manner of their management. They have all had a serious, if not formal, overhauling, except that of Foreign Missions and that of Church Extension. We do not know why these two have escaped, unless the distant scene of the practical operations of the former, and the youth of the latter, have contributed to this exemption. It can not be that their management is infallible. Perhaps their day is coming; and now that the Board of Publication is disposed of, their turn may come in the next Assembly. When we speak of carping, we judge from what we have personally witnessed in the discussions of former years. We by no means condemn just criticism. The Boards are responsible to the whole church, through the General Assembly. If any person is displeased with their management, if serious faults exist, complaints and investigation may be required. But, as in other things, it is sometimes better to bear with some faults—or, if it can be done, seek a remedy in another way—than to bring

complaints into the Assembly, excite bitter discussions, indulge in severe condemnation of men of unblemished reputation (as has been observed, especially in former years), and thus tend to undermine the confidence of the church in these important instrumentalities for carrying on its great work.

2. No one can have witnessed the discussions to which we refer without the impression that there were matters of a personal nature mixed up with the measures taken and the ends sought. This is a great scandal. We do not profess to know what the merits of these personal differences may be among, chiefly, we believe, our good friends of the City of Brotherly Love. We trust there are merits in the case, and hope they perceive them more clearly than we do, or we are sorry for all concerned. But we exhort them to settle their personal differences hereafter at home, and not parade them before the whole church; at least, not bring them up, annually, to the Assembly.

3. The report of the Investigating Committee upon the Board of Publication is an able document. Full confidence is felt in the committee who made it, and we have no doubt the Assembly acted on its best judgment in adopting its chief recommendations. We have as little doubt, from the light we possess, that some of the radical changes made are unwise. We are led to this conclusion, partly from the views presented in the foregoing protest, partly from the experienced judgment expressed by men who have been connected with the Board from its origin, and who have published their views since the rising of the Assembly, and, in part, from what appears stamped upon the very surface of the case.

Retrenchment of expenditure is sometimes an economical, and sometimes a very expensive, affair, when ultimate interests are consulted; and we believe it was in the interest of retrenchment, for the most part, that these "reforms" suggested. That the insurance effected for the Secretary's benefit should be annulled, we think wise; not because of the amount—it was but a trifle—but from the principle involved, unless the Assembly is prepared to sanction the life insurance of all its agents who are similarly situated. We presume this is the only case of the life insurance of a secretary in any of the Boards by the funds of the church at large.

But most of the other reductions and changes we think decidedly injurious. Of the change respecting the Treasurer, however, we can not so well judge, not knowing the amount of labor the office imposes, or measure of responsibility incurred. Our opinion inclines to the side that it was a mistake. The case of the Editor, in our judgment, admits of little doubt. The Corresponding Secretary can not do the work of the Editor of the Board as it should be done, simply for want of time, without infringing upon his other duties, and thus injuring the interests of the Board in the most vital department, we hesitate not to say, of all its operations. It is a positive physical and intellectual impossibility, unless we have mistaken entirely what belongs to the duties, respectively of these offices.

But upon this whole subject of these or any other changes so radical, and especially about the amount of capital needed for the largest and most efficient amount of service for the church, we would rather submit the entire management of such a vast interest to a board of such experience, practical business, Christian men, as composed the Board of Publication located in Philadelphia, or in any other large commercial city, than to the judgment upon their acts for a given examination of the ablest committee any General Assembly ever appointed, and much sooner than to submit the matter for final decision to the wisest General Assembly, so large and pressed with so much business, that ever was convened in this country or any other. We think it will be found, in the end, and at no distant period, that many of these changes have proved injurious to those great interests which this Board was organized to promote.

The General Assembly is of course supreme on this theater. Its will must be obeyed whether its agents approve its decisions or not. The Board of Publication have made the changes required, and the experiment is to be tried. We sincerely regret, however, that we lose the services of such long-tried men as Drs. Engles and Boardman, and others from the councils of this Board.

ACTION UPON SLAVERY.

We present, within a very moderate compass, all that was said and done upon this subject, in the late Assembly, so far as we find it reported in any of our religious journals :

The Committee on Bills and Overtures reported :

Overture No. 16.—Request from the Presbytery of Saline, that the General Assembly solemnly reëffirm the testimony of 1818, in regard to slavery, the committee report :

The Assembly has, from the first, uttered its sentiments upon the subject of slavery in substantially the same language. The action of 1818 was taken with more care, and made more clear, full and explicit, and was adopted unanimously. It has since remained that true and Scriptural deliverance on this important subject, by which our church is determined to abide. It has never been repealed, amended or modified, but has frequently been referred to and reiterated by subsequent Assemblies; and when some persons fancied that the action of 1845 in some way interfered with it, the Assembly of 1846 declared, with much unanimity, that the action of 1845 was not intended to deny or rescind the testimony on this subject previously uttered by General Assemblies; and by their deliverances we still abide.

The report was accepted.

Dr. Humphrey moved that the report be amended by inserting before the words 'these deliverances' the word 'all' making it read—'By all these deliverances we abide.'

Rev. Mr. Phraner urged the Assembly to reëffirm unanimously the action of 1818 upon this subject. The matter was one which had been handed down from that day unimpaired, and he desired to see it reëffirmed by a unanimous vote.

Dr. Nevin moved to lay the amendment on the table. Carried.

Dr. Humphrey moved to lay the whole subject on the table. Lost.

Dr. Nevin called for the ayes and nays. The call was not sustained.

The report of the committee was then adopted.

This action, as we understand it, leaves the testimony of the Assembly where it has stood from the beginning, merely reiterating, in plain language, the judgment of the fathers of the church, North and South.

STATE OF THE CHURCH AND THE COUNTRY.

The Assembly adopted two very important papers on this subject, which we present in full. As the matter was brought to the notice of the body upon an incidental question, without the design apparently to introduce the whole subject of the relations of the church to the State—as a *reconnaissance* sometimes brings on a battle unintentionally—we give the preliminary debate arising upon this question. The following is an account of the initiatory proceedings, which were taken on the sixth day of the sessions :

“Elder T. H. Nevin moved that a committee of three should be appointed to raise the flag of the country over the church. To this motion he did not anticipate any opposition.

Mr. Valentine hoped the motion would not pass. There was no necessity of placarding or testifying their loyalty. We have now floating over us the flag of Jesus Christ, bearing upon it Christ and Him crucified. There was no necessity for dragging in at this time of outside agitation, questions which serve only to distract debate. Though the flag was never loved so much as now, though at this time it was necessarily dear to us, yet we had unfurled the flag of Jesus Christ and none other should supplant it. The loyalty of the Assembly was undoubted, it needed no outside testimonial to that effect.

Rev. H. C. Reed opposed the resolution. He did not think the Assembly needed this evidence of its loyalty after the many prayers that had been offered for the welfare of the country in the Assembly. He had heard of an artist who painted an animal and wrote under it, ‘this is a dog.’ He did not think we needed anything of this kind.

A motion to lay the above motion on the table called forth the ayes and noes.

Rev. Mr. Plumbly rose to a question of privilege. He desired the member moving the motion would take some action which should relieve the Assembly from this unpleasant predicament.

Mr. Conger asked to be excused from voting. The Assembly refused to grant the request, and he voted ‘No.’ The vote resulted as follows : ayes, 90 ; noes, 129 ; total, 219. And the motion to lay it upon the table was lost.

Mr. Delancy stated there was one consideration which had not yet been presented. Though he had voted to lay the motion upon the table, yet he had no objection if the trustees desired it, that the American flag should be raised. But the church was in the hands of the trustees to do with it as they saw fit. The Assembly had no right to use property

which did not belong to them. He therefore moved that the matter be referred to the trustees of the church for them to do as they thought proper. He did not wish to be placed in a false position. He left New Orleans when the last American flag was torn down there, and wept tears of joy when, six months after, it floated over the court-house in the city of Louisville.

Mr. Shedd sustained the motion of Mr. Delancy, and for similar reasons.

Rev. Mr. Young stated that the pastor of the church authorized him to say that he would be pleased to have the flag of his country raised upon the church, and he doubted not the trustees would concur. The church, he said, had been passed to the service of the Assembly and the ownership of the church for the time being was vested in the Assembly.

Mr. Delancy demurred: If by this or any other act of the Assembly he asked, the church should be destroyed, who would assume the responsibility?

Mr. Young continued: The trustees, he doubted not, would be pleased to have the flag thus raised. So far as he himself was concerned, he could not regard any man who was not in favor of raising the flag of his country over every place wherever he was, as exhibiting a great degree of love for his country.

The Rev. Mr. Brownson did not wish to impeach the loyalty of any man upon the floor of the Assembly. He himself would throw out no imputation to that effect, but he was at a loss to conceive what objection could be reasonably made to the proposed demonstration.

The Rev. Dr. Nevin regarded the matter as one of importance. It had been asserted that there were no disloyal men upon the floor of the Assembly; but there were those at least who were suspected of disloyalty, and those who had been arraigned in their own locality because of such suspicion.

The Rev. Mr. Beers said where he was known no one doubted his loyalty. He objected to the raising of the flag upon the church merely upon the ground of expediency, and for this reason had voted to lay the resolution upon the table. It was not necessary to attest the loyalty of the Assembly by windy and wordy resolutions, or by similar acts. They were not assembled for that purpose, nor was it rendered imperative, for their loyalty was undoubted. He did not regard this a matter which should be called a question of loyalty or disloyalty. For himself, he had four brothers who had enlisted in the service of their country, one of whom had laid down his life upon the field of battle, and he himself would make the fifth before this rebellion should succeed. While he did not object to the raising of the flag as an expression of patriotism, he did not think this the proper place or time to do it.

Dr. Humphrey, of Kentucky, said the flag was the symbol of the country, and we all love it. He did not suppose that Dr. Nevin intended to impeach the loyalty of any person on the floor, and particularly those who came from a section of country where it cost something to be loyal. When Congress was in session the flag of the country was raised above the capitol at the commencement of its deliberations, and lowered again at its adjournment, in order that the public might be informed when those legislative councils were in session. As a national body, sitting in the name of the people and the country, this was eminently proper, but it was not called for in a body sitting in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. And, sir, said the speaker, it has not been the custom of the Presbyterian Church in this country at any time to recognize symbols. Even the sacred symbol of the cross, typical of the suffering and death of the beloved Master, was not placed upon the church. Symbols of any kind were not recognized, and had not been, and especially at this time was it unnecessary. The speaker detailed the practice and method of opening the church or kirk in Scotland, and drew from it a comparison between the manner there and custom attendant upon the opening of public assemblies of that nature in this country. Will we gain anything, asked the reverend gentleman, by a divided vote upon this question? Upon this motion to lay upon the table, 90 have voted for it, and 129 against it. That, sir, is a very large representation, and is it to be said that the Assembly is divided upon this subject? Shall it go forth to the world, that on such a subject as this, the Assembly stands one against the other? Will it, he asked, help them much in the Border States, where we desire to preserve the church intact? Sir, it is not without much effort and labor that we are now enabled to do this, and how much more difficult will it be if these matters are to be permitted to convulse and exercise the minds of members. Undoubtedly, sir, the church is loyal, and no one can safely question it. Read all that has been said, witness all that has been done, and is there anything which can be construed as disloyal? Then, I beseech you, let me plead the cause of my brethren in the Border States. It requires there the exercise already of a spirit of peace and forbearance to preserve the church intact, to keep it in its purity, and uncontaminated with matters which in no wise relate to it. And we must do all we can to maintain it. Sir, we love our church—perhaps some of us even better than our country. Beyond all things else, our faith stands foremost in our affections. But, sir, this resolution can do you but little good, in the North, and it certainly will do us none in the Border States.

A member: How will it do harm in the Border States?

Dr. Humphrey: By kindling excitement and giving rise to agitation in the church in the Border States. He did not desire to enter into

argument to show why it was so, for if he did, he would be obliged to bring into controversy names and circumstances which he had no inclination to mention upon this floor. The brethren knew him, and knew him well. You, Mr. Moderator, know that I am a New Englander, but for many years have resided in Kentucky. The ashes of my parents are in Kentucky; the ashes of my children repose in Massachusetts and in the former State. I have stood in my own home when the enemy's bullets whistled about his house and family. He had seen the practical workings of the rebellion. What he had offered in this connection he had presented candidly, and trusted it would be taken in the same spirit. Let it be received for what it is worth.

Dr. J. M. Lowrie said that Dr. Humphrey had stated a divided vote on this subject would injure us abroad. Well, let all the members vote the right way, and no harm will be done. But there was another way of reaching the matter, and he would, therefore, move that the whole subject be referred to a committee of seven, who should report to this Assembly. This motion was then seconded, and Dr. Lowrie proceeded to speak to it. He would further say, that while there was some conflict among the members in regard to political matters, he yet thought there was no doubt of their loyalty. If it was true, as stated, that the general principles of our church excluded the use of symbols, there can yet be no inconsistency in hanging out this flag, for it took the place of no symbol of the church, nor excluded any. It would simply hang as an evidence of our loyalty and devotion to it.

Dr. Beatty was in favor of the motion to appoint a committee. He voted to lay the original motion upon the table, but even his best friends favored it. He did not doubt the loyalty of any man in the house. Mr. Young, who was his warm friend, had said he did not regard a man as loyal, who objected to seeing the flag floating in every place. The flag floated over his own house and home. It was the flag his father fought under, and the flag he loved. But he objected to a flag floating over a church, because he did not regard it as the proper place.

Mr. Young explained. He wished to be understood as saying, that he did not regard a man as loyal who objected to seeing the flag float over the whole country.

Dr. Beatty: Probably the brother meant that, but he was not so understood. I am satisfied with his explanation, but I did not like his sweeping assertion. The divided vote placed the Assembly in a false position. He protested against this false representation before the world. It carried the idea of a disregard for the flag, when such was not the case. No one objected to the act, as a display of patriotism, but others with himself thought this not the proper place for it."

The original motion, as amended, to refer the matter to a committee of seven, was then adopted. The next morning, Mr.

Goodall moved "that the whole subject of our relations to the country," be referred to this committee, which was adopted. The Moderator appointed as this committee, Rev. Drs. J. M. Lowrie, E. P. Humphrey, Loyal Young, and James I. Brownson; and Judges H. H. Leavitt and Hovey K. Clarke, and Robert Carter, Esq.

This committee, through their chairman, Rev. Dr. J. M. Lowrie, subsequently presented the following report:

"The committee to whom was referred the resolution which proposed to raise the flag of the United States upon the building in which the Assembly is now convened, and to report in respect to the state of the country, respectfully present the following report:

Your committee believe that the design of the mover of the original resolution and of the large majority, who, apparently, are ready to vote for its adoption, is simply to call forth from the Assembly a significant token of our sympathy with this Government in its earnest efforts to suppress a rebellion, that now for over two years has wickedly stood in armed resistance to lawful and beneficent authority. But as there are many among us who are undoubtedly patriotic, who are willing to express any righteous principle to which this Assembly should give utterance, touching the subjection and attachment of an American citizen to the Union and its institutions, who love the flag of our country and rejoice in its successes by sea and by land, and who yet do not esteem this particular act a testimonial of loyalty entirely becoming to a church court; and, as many of these brethren, by the pressing of this vote, would be placed in a false position, as if they did not love the Union, of which that flag is the beloved symbol, your committee deem themselves authorized by the subsequent direction of the Assembly to propose a different action to be adopted by this venerable court.

It is well known, on the one hand, that the General Assembly has ever been reluctant to repeat its testimonies upon important matters of public interest; but, having given utterance to carefully considered words, is content to abide calmly by its recorded deliverances. Nothing that this Assembly can say can more fully express the wickedness of the rebellion that has cost so much blood and treasure; can declare, in plainer terms, the guilt before God and man, of those who have inaugurated, or maintained, or countenanced, for so little cause, this fratricidal strife; or can more impressively urge the solemn duty of the Government to the lawful exercise of its authority, and of the people, each in his several place, to uphold the civil authorities, to the end that law and order may again reign throughout the entire nation; than these things have already been done by previous Assemblies. Nor need this body declare its solemn rebukes toward those ministers and members of the Church of Christ,

who have aided in bringing on and sustaining these immense calamities ; or tender our kind sympathies to those who are overtaken by troubles they could not avoid, and who mourn and weep in secret places, not unseen by the Father's eye ; or reprove all willful disturbers of the public peace ; or exhort those that are subject to our care, to the careful discharge of every duty tending to uphold the free and beneficent government under which we are, and this specially for conscience' sake and as in the sight of God, more than in regard to all these things, the General Assembly has made its solemn deliverances since these troubles began.

But on the other hand, it may be well for this General Assembly to re-affirm—as it now solemnly does—the great principles to which utterance has already been given. We do this the more readily because our beloved church may thus be understood to take her deliberate and well-chosen stand, free from all imputations of haste or excitement ; because we recognize an entire harmony between the duties of the citizen (especially in a land where the people frame their own laws and choose their own rulers), and the duties of the Christian to the Great Head of the Church ; because, indeed, least of all persons, should Christian citizens even seem to stand back from their duty when bad men press forward for mischief ; and because a true love for our country in her times of peril should forbid us to withhold an expression of our attachment, for the insufficient reason that we are not accustomed to repeat our utterances.

And because there are those among us, who have scruples touching the propriety of any deliverance of a church court respecting civil matters, this Assembly would add, that all strifes of party politics, should indeed be banished from our ecclesiastical assemblies and from our pulpits ; that Christian people should earnestly guard against promoting partisan divisions ; and that the difficulty of accurately deciding, in some cases, what are general and what party principles, should make us careful in our judgments ; but that our duty is none the less imperative to uphold the constituted authorities, because minor delicate questions may possibly be involved. Rather, the sphere of the church is wider and more searching, touching matters of great public interest, than the sphere of the civil magistrate, *in this important respect*, that the civil authorities can take the cognizance only of overt acts, while the law of which the Church of God is the interpreter, searches the heart, makes every man subject to the civil authority for conscience' sake, and declares that man truly guilty who allows himself to be alienated in sympathy and feeling from any lawful duty, or who does not conscientiously prefer the welfare and especially the preservation of the government, to any party or partisan ends. Officers may not always command a citizen's confidence ; measures may by him be deemed unwise ; earnest, lawful efforts may be made for changes he may think desirable ; but no causes now exist to

vindicate the disloyalty of American citizens toward the United States Government.

This General Assembly would not withhold from the Government of the United States that expression of cordial sympathy which a loyal people should offer. We believe that God has afforded us ample resources to suppress this rebellion, and that with his blessing it will ere long be accomplished; we would animate those who are discouraged by the continuance and fluctuations of these costly strifes to remember and rejoice in the supreme government of our God who often leads through perplexity and darkness; we would exhort to penitence for all our national sins, to sobriety and humbleness of mind before the Great Ruler of all, and to constant prayerfulness for the Divine blessing; and we would entreat our people to beware of all schemes implying resistance to the lawfully constituted authorities, by any other means than are recognized as lawful to be openly prosecuted. And as this Assembly is ready to declare our unalterable attachment and adherence to the Union established by our fathers, and our unqualified condemnation of the rebellion; to proclaim to the world the United States, one and undivided, as our country; the lawfully chosen rulers of the land, our rulers; the Government of the United States, our civil government; and its honored flag, our flag; and to affirm that we are bound in the truest and strictest fidelity to the duties of Christian citizens under a government that has strewn its blessings with a profuse hand, your committee recommend that the particular act contemplated in the original resolution be no further urged upon the attention of this body.

The report was accepted.

Dr. Lowrie stated that the report was concurred in with the exception of Dr. Humphrey.

Dr. Humphrey stated that he found to his regret he could not concur with his brethren of the committee. He did not intend to submit a minority report; but when the matter came up for action before the Assembly, he would state his views upon the matter and present a substitute for the report."

When this paper came up for consideration, Rev. R. A. Delancy proposed an amendment to the last clause, which here follows, with the discussion upon it, together with the substitute for the whole paper presented by Dr. Humphrey, the discussion, and the final vote:

"Mr. Delancy desired to report the following amendment to the last clause:

The trustees of this church concurring in the desire expressed by many members of this Assembly to have displayed from this edifice the

American flag, the beautiful symbol of national protection, unity and liberty.

Dr. Humphrey objected to its introduction at this moment, thinking it might be more appropriately presented at a subsequent period.

Mr. Delancy's amendment was adopted.

Dr. Humphrey said he stated to the Assembly on Saturday that he had the unhappiness not to be able to agree with his brethren in the report submitted. He proposed to indicate a little different action, and submit a substitute. He had intended some remarks, but the time of the house was more precious and it is possible (he hoped they would escape it) they might be thrown into agitation. He was prepared for discussion, but in order to avoid all agitation he hoped the question would be taken entirely without debate. He would read his substitute in order that those present should vote understandingly, and he believed that there should be taken a religious view of the subject in such a body as this.

Dr. Humphrey's substitute is as follows :

The General Assembly of 1861 adopted a minute on the state of the church and the country. The Assembly of 1862 uttered a more formal and comprehensive deliverance. In the mean time a certain number, perhaps the larger portion, of the presbyteries and synods have expressed their judgments on the same subject. This General Assembly is persuaded that the office bearers and members of this church, with the presbyteries represented here, are, in a remarkable degree, united in a strict and true allegiance to the Constitution and Government of the United States ; and that they are, as a body, loyal both to the church and civil government as ordinances of God.

This General Assembly contents itself, on that part of the subject, by enjoining upon all the people of God, who acknowledge this church as their church to uphold, according as God shall give them strength, the authority of the Constitution and laws of the land in this time of supreme national peril. But this Assembly would most distinctly and solemnly inculcate upon all its people, the duty of humbly confessing before God the great unworthiness and the many sins of the people of this land, and of acknowledging the holiness and justice of the Almighty in the present visitation. He is righteous in all His ways and holy in all His works. We exhort our brethren to seek the gift of the Holy Ghost by prayer, confession and repentance, so that the anger of the Lord may be turned away from us, and that the spirit of piety may become not less predominant and vital in the church than the spirit of an awakened patriotism.

And this Assembly connecting the experience of our present trials with the remembrance of those through which the church has passed, does now recall and adopt the sentiments of our fathers in the Church of Scotland, as those are expressed for substance in the Solemn League

and Covenant of 1643: 'And because the people of this land are guilty of many sins and provocations against God and his Son Jesus Christ, as is manifest by our present distresses and danger, the fruits thereof we profess and declare before God and the world our unfeigned desire to be humbled for our own sins and the sins of the people especially that we have not as we ought valued the inestimable benefit of the gospel nor labored for the purity and power thereof; and that we have not as we ought endeavored to receive Christ in our hearts, nor to walk worthy of him in our lives which are the cause of other sins and the transgressions so much abounding among us; and our trust, unfeigned purpose, desire and endeavor for ourselves and all others under our charge, both in public and private, in all duties we owe to God and man to amend our lives, and each one to go before another in the example of a real reformation, that the Lord may turn away his wrath and heavy indignation, and establish the church and the land in truth and peace.'

Dr. H. continued: He would be happy to see the questions upon all these subjects taken without debate, and offered his paper as an amendment, striking out of the original report all after the first paragraph and substituting the one offered by him.

The original report of the committee was then read by the Stated Clerk.

The members of the Assembly took occasion to express their opinions liberally upon the proposition to pass upon the respective papers without debate.

Dr. Wines moved that the subject be postponed to afternoon, and that the two papers be printed this forenoon for the use of the Assembly.

Judge Leavitt moved that the whole subject be referred to a special committee to consist of Drs. Humphrey and Lowrie.

Dr. Wines and Dr. Nevin opposed such reference for the reason that several had remained over for the special purpose of voting upon this subject.

Rev. Mr. Sheddan was in favor of recommitment for the reason that he believed the two papers could be combined and such a paper could be produced as would meet the concurrence of all, and if the 'disloyal 90' could stay a day longer to vote upon it certainly the other side could do the same thing.

Dr. Humphrey stated that he was sorry to say that he did not believe that the chairman of the committee and himself could agree as to which should be the predominant tone of the paper, religious or patriotic. His idea was that the report of the committee should recommend humiliation of the church before God, while the committee believed the prevailing tone of the report should be patriotic.

Judge Leavitt's motion to recommit was lost.

The question then recurring upon Dr. Wines' motion to postpone consideration till afternoon, it was lost.

The Rev. Mr. Plumley moved an amendment to the amendment, that all of the report of the committee be stricken out, with the exception of the amendment of Mr. Delancy.

The reading of Dr. Humphrey's paper was again called for, which was read.

The previous question, having been called for, was ordered.

The question then recurring upon the original report submitted by Dr. Lowrie, and amended by Mr. Delancy, the ayes and noes were called for, and the call was sustained.

The vote was then announced as follows :

Ayes, 176 ; noes, 20.

On motion privilege was granted those absent to subsequently record their names.

Rev. Mr. McMillen, of Kentucky, was, by request, excused from voting.

Dr. Hickok then moved the adoption of Dr. Humphrey's paper, with a slight modification. A motion to amend by adopting the whole paper was accepted, and the ayes and noes being taken upon it resulted in its adoption. All the members voting in the affirmative with the exception of E. S. Wilson, of Vincennes, Indiana.

On motion those not present at the time the vote was taken were permitted to record their votes."

One other item completes the record of this exciting and important business, and we present it, as follows :

" Rev. Mr. Baker presented the following protest against the action of the Assembly, with the request that it be entered upon the records, viz. :

The undersigned beg leave to protest against the action of the General Assembly in adopting the report of the Committee on the State of the Country ; because while on the one hand it rightly denounces rebellion, and enjoins the duty of reverence and obedience to the powers that be, on the other it fails to recognize the fundamental antagonism there is between the kingdom of Christ in its origin, progress and destiny, and every form of the world-power, not founded upon it."

This action upon the condition of the church and the country calls for no particular notice at our hands. The position which the *Danville Review* has taken, from the first, upon this whole subject, is well known. It is, with all its conductors, unmistakably loyal to the Government and the Union, in our present struggle for National existence.

We can not forbear, however, noticing one feature of the movement in the Assembly—the initiatory step—by a passing remark. The proposition for a flag raising, by a vote of the General Assembly, was what the language of the times would characterize as partaking rather too much of the “sensational” and “spread-eagle” order of doing things, for such a body. At least, this is our opinion. The discussion showed that it was not, on either side, made a test of loyalty, and the decision arrived at was wise.

Where a congregation manifests, as in some instances has been the case, open disloyalty, and the military authorities order the flag to be hoisted upon the church edifice, willing obedience or otherwise becomes a proper test. In that case, the order should be obeyed. So, if the trustees of a congregation choose to raise the flag where a presbytery, or a synod, or the General Assembly, may sit, so be it. But the eagerness which has often been noticed, in some places, to raise the United States flag upon churches, to display it within the church, and to cover the pulpit with it—not even with the excuse of a national day, as the anniversary of our independence, or a national fast day, but upon occasions of ordinary Sabbath worship—when nobody suspected the loyalty of the people there worshiping, when there seemed to be no occasion for it, except to make a vain parade; all this we regard as wholly unbecoming the dignity and gravity which should mark all the proceedings of religious bodies, and the worship of our ordinary religious assemblies.

INTEGRITY OF THE CHURCH—WITHDRAWAL OF THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIES AND SYNODS.

The question has been up in different forms—sometimes at the opening of the General Assembly when making up or subsequently calling the roll, sometimes when electing members of the several Boards, and again when determining the form of the printed Minutes, and in other ways—whether the presbyteries and synods, which the public well knew had formally withdrawn from all connection with the General Assembly, and had formed a Southern General Assembly, should still be regarded as an integral portion of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

This question was discussed, at some length, in the Assembly of 1862, and the decision was, or rather the tacit understanding (for we believe no decision was entered in the proceedings), that the schism should be ignored, and the church regarded, in form at least, as not divided. Hence, the clerk, with solemn voice and grave countenance, on calling presbyteries and synods at that Assembly, called over the names of ten synods and forty-four presbyteries, beginning with the Presbytery of Greenbrier, in the Synod of Virginia, and ending with the Presbytery of Central Texas, in the Synod of Texas, although everybody knew there was not a single member on the floor from any of those ten synods and forty-four presbyteries, and that there would not be. And hence, also, determined to carry out this idea of the church intact, when the statistical tables of that year were printed, the Minutes exhibited some forty continuous pages of blank reports from these presbyteries. And, as a still further illustration of the same idea, at least one of the Boards—that of Publication—in its “Statement of Receipts for Colportage,” in its Annual Report made to the Assembly of 1863, parades, in its tables, the full list of these presbyteries and synods by name, from which, of course, as the formidable array of blank lines shows, it received nothing. These are some of the forms which the idea of unbroken unity assumed.

This process of roll-calling, in the Assembly of 1862, was too ludicrous for long continuance, and we believe was not repeated more than once. It reminds us of a similar proceeding, equally grave, which we witnessed in the Senate of the United States soon after the secession of States began, in the winter of 1861. Great men, in both state and church, have made progress in their views of the rebellion since then. At every call in the Senate for the ayes and noes, even after all the senators, from all the States that had seceded, had gone, the Secretary, having no authority to do otherwise, called the name of every senator, secessionists and all. At length, certain members getting tired of the proceeding, the question was raised, whether the members from the seceded States should be called, and the majority decided that their *seats* must be recognized, whether anybody was in them or not. Hence, the call went on, and a dozen times a day the farce

was played, to the amusement of all lookers-on. We are not sure, but believe it was the same in the house of Representatives. This practice, however, terminated with the session of Congress, ending on the 4th of March, 1861. No roll-call of rebel senators or representatives was heard in either branch at the special session which convened on the 4th of July, 1861, nor at any of the regular sessions held since. Their designs were too well known, after the guns of Sumter, to statesmen and politicians of all grades and parties, to lead any one to suppose they would ever voluntarily return to occupy the vacated seats.

At the Assembly of 1863, some progress was made, touching the matter of continuing to recognize the presbyteries and synods referred to, so far as bore upon the integrity of the church. Although the Narrative adopted—a most excellent paper—laments that, “from the presbyteries embraced within the lines of the atrocious rebellion now desolating the southern portion of country, we have received no reports”—keeping up the idea of a church intact—yet, in several particulars, the Assembly took action, after earnest discussion, which implied that it regarded the division of the church an accomplished fact. Among the last things done, Dr. Beatty moved, “That in our printed minutes, presbyteries in the southern synods, who make no report to the Assembly, be omitted,” and the motion was carried. This, of course, was not aimed at such presbyteries as occasionally, in all parts of the church, fail to send up reports; but plainly was intended for those embraced within the schism, and identified with the southern Assembly. The Assembly was fully prepared for this by what had previously taken place. The question had arisen in another form, on a prior day, and had been fully considered. It was brought up, incidentally, in the report of the committee on the Annual Report of the Board of Education. The whole proceeding is interesting, and we give the account as we find it in one of our religious journals:

“One section of this report, striking from the list of members of this Board the names of a number of gentlemen now in the South, and who had allied themselves with the new southern church, elicited a warm discussion, and was rejected by the Assembly, several delegates declaring it contrary to the constitution to decide that the

places of these members were vacant before their terms had expired. A subsequent motion to reconsider this action was also discussed at great length, one member urging that if they had no law which would admit of excluding these gentlemen from the Board, it was time the Assembly made one. The motion was finally adopted. The question then recurring upon the original motion, striking out the resolution of the committee, an amendment was offered, striking from the section the names of Dr. Dabney and Dr. Leland. On motion of W. C. Lawson, the matter was then referred to the committee on the Board of Education, with instructions to examine into the authority of the Assembly to take action in this regard. This committee immediately reported back the section modified in accordance with this motion, upon which it was adopted, and the names of Dr. Dabney, Dr. Leland and Major D. H. Hill were erased."

The question, it thus appears, was up for consideration several times, earnestly canvassed at great length, recommitted, again reported and considered, and, after having been decided in opposite ways, was finally settled to the apparent satisfaction of the Assembly. We find no part of this debate reported, nor any more full account of it than we have here introduced, nor does it appear that the votes were recorded. All of this we regret, for the matters involved concerned principles of a radical nature, as bearing upon the integrity of the church and the character of the schism which had caused its disruption, and evidently the Assembly was much divided in opinion.

D. H. Hill, mentioned above, is an elder in the Presbyterian Church, and was a member of the General Assembly, at Indianapolis, in 1859, from North Carolina. He was a professor in a military institute in the South, and is now a major general in the rebel army. Rev. Dr. Dabney was, and perhaps still is, a professor in the Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. If truly reported, he was one of the staff of the famous "Stonewall Jackson," another elder. The military character or warlike exploits of these gentlemen, whose names, with that of the venerable Dr. Leland, professor in the Columbia, South Carolina, Theological Seminary, were dropped by the Assembly, had nothing to do with determining its action. We accept it as the recognition of a notorious fact concerning the division of the church. We may therefore regard the

question settled, so far as this action of the Assembly can settle it. The Assembly has recognized the schism, by this positive decision, and no longer regards those ten synods and forty-four presbyteries as a part of the church in connection with the General Assembly. These incidental matters, upon which the question turned, have decided the point as clearly as any more formal deliverance could have done, for the principle of integrity and disruption was involved in them.

The state and the church here occupy different ground. Whatever may be true of the nation, now or ultimately, the church is sundered, and it was well, therefore, in the General Assembly, to accept the fact, and act accordingly. No one supposes that in the final action of the two Houses of Congress upon the vacated seats of senators and representatives, any recognition of a separation of the States, or severance of the Union, or acknowledgment of secession, or divided nationality, in any way, was intended. On the contrary, in every patriotic utterance in each branch of Congress there was a rigid maintenance of the doctrine that we are one people still, have one constitution, one government, and that our territory is one and undivided; and, in order to make all this good in fact, as it is claimed to be in form, the nation is putting forth its strength by the sword. If successful, the national integrity will be preserved. This use of compulsory force is within the legitimate province of the civil power, and among its acknowledged rights.

But the church stands on different ground. It must acquiesce in its own disruption. It has no power to prevent it if it would; nor can it restore any portion that may choose to continue separated from the main body. And, also, leaving wholly out of view the question of power, even its rightful authority, touching the whole matter of schism, especially as this is most commonly illustrated in practice in all branches of the Protestant Church, is qualified and limited according to circumstances. A minister, viewing his usefulness or happiness in his ecclesiastical relations, or for other reasons satisfactory to himself, not involving heresy or immorality, may withdraw from one branch and join another; and generally no proceedings are taken, if matters are conducted with due respect toward the body forsaken, further than to drop his

name from the roll, or in some other way recognize his departure, either with or without detailing the circumstances. Such cases are occurring constantly in all branches of the church. They occur in our own, and acquiescence is given; and that, too, not upon the ground of inability to prevent it, but upon the higher ground of ecclesiastical principle—that every man is left free to choose his ecclesiastical relations, and free to change them, being responsible only to the Head of the church. A man, indeed, is free from man and from the church upon the whole matter of faith and practice; much more, then, as to the outward form of alliance he shall make or maintain with the church. No individual, however, should break off from the church, and form new relations, without good reasons, for it tends to unsettle others, and to demoralize and destroy the whole body, and the evil is generally in proportion to the standing and influence of the person. If it be a minister, it is more noted, and the evil more extended. But when the question of separation rises to a higher level, and concerns a congregation, or a presbytery, or a synod, or several of them, the gravity of the case is greatly enhanced. Other principles of moral propriety enter into it besides those which environ an individual, or which even concern the mere extent of the separation of ecclesiastical bodies, and the influence immediately consequent thereupon. By such separation, a new sect may be formed, or many of them, new antagonisms developed in the body of Christ, and thus the evils of the spectacle, now presented to the world from the numerous and contending bodies into which Christians are divided, may become immeasurably diversified in character, and intensified in power, and the cause of truth be subverted or greatly hindered. These and a variety of other considerations are to be taken into the account in determining the true character of any case of disruption, and especially should we weigh the causes alleged, real or supposed, impelling thereto; while, at the same time, we grant perfect freedom of action to Christian bodies as to individuals, within the bounds of reason and propriety, in determining their own ecclesiastical relations, and freely admit the want of either power or authority in the church to prevent it.

While, therefore, in some cases, a separation of the church

may be warranted, it is nevertheless clear that if the reasons are not justifiable in any case, the disruption is schism, and schism is a sin, reaching far and wide. The Scriptures characterize it as a sin of uncommon turpitude, in proportion to its elements, magnitude, and results. It is nothing less than a ruthless rending of the very body of the Redeemer. It is placed in open contrast with one of the highest types of Christianity, and one of the brightest exhibitions of grace—the unity of Christ's body, in a union of the members with one another through the Spirit, and the union by the Spirit of each and all with Christ and in Him, even as Christ and the Father are one.

Now, as to the presbyteries and synods which have broken off from ours and formed the Southern General Assembly, while we can not justify the disruption upon any grounds alleged or known, still we are obliged to recognize the fact that they have gone. The separation was their own act, and theirs alone. We have acquiesced in it. We think the manner of acquiescence by the General Assembly was, perhaps, on the whole, the best way to meet the case.

There was no sufficient cause for separation on their part. *It was schism.* Their course was taken, in some instances, before and wholly independent of the action of the General Assembly in 1861, as many facts published by themselves plainly show; and in every case, without any warrant arising out of the action, at any time or in any manner, *of the church* from which they departed. It was the course of things pending *in the State* which shaped their policy, and was allowed to decide their destiny. The church trailed its garments in the dust and obsequiously chained itself to the chariot of the world. In some cases it was content with following the civil power, bowing submissively to its decrees, regarding the secession of a state as calling for a disruption of the church. In other cases it anticipated the civil power. Even before the secession of a single one of the states of the Union, the Synod of South Carolina, by the most deliberate and formal action, decided to cast in its fortunes with those of the state of that name, promising to follow where it should lead; to sever itself bodily from the church even as the state would withdraw itself from the Union. This was all the more remarkable, and illustrates the madness of the times and of the act, as

coming from those who had so stoutly maintained the total disconnection of the church from any alliance with the civil power, and had so constantly manifested an apparently deep-seated and holy horror at mixing things spiritual and secular.

Nor was there any necessity for this course, even admitting the hastily assumed fact that the civil disruption would be permanent; no necessity whatever, even in that case, for ecclesiastical separation, much less any antecedent necessity for declaring in favor of it, to the encouragement of the State in its revolt, but in this light there was every thing against it. The finality of a civil disruption might make the separation of the church *desirable*. It could not make it *essential*. When Texas was a department of Mexico, our church extended there, and its presbytery was connected with and a constituent part of a synod in the United States—the Synod of Mississippi—whose boundaries extended indefinitely in that direction, and this presbytery was represented in the General Assembly. When, subsequently, Texas became an independent republic, breaking off from Mexico by revolution, the relations of our church in that nation were not disturbed. When, still later, that republic became one of the states of the Union, our ecclesiastical affairs there remained the same. Amid all these mutations of the civil power, through scenes of violence and civil war, and under three different and successive nationalities, our church remained intact, spreading its ample banner over the whole; and the only ecclesiastical change which occurred was one of expansion and progress, with still preserved unity, beginning with the single Presbytery of Texas, when Texas was a department of Mexico, and ultimately multiplying itself into three presbyteries and becoming the Synod of Texas under the last phase the civil power assumed.

And why might it not have been so in the rebel states of the South? Even though the men of the church there, had absolutely foreseen as certain, that the issue of secession, whether with war or without, would be two nations, still this need not have resulted in two churches. No one can say that the unity of the church would then have been an impossibility, any more than this could have been alleged, antecedently to the event, in the case of the church in Texas under the several changes

which the civil power assumed. Whatever would have been *expedient*, separation would not have been a *necessity*. And we say, therefore, that it should not have occurred, in any event, except on grounds of the most pressing urgency, and never under the circumstances in which it was initiated; for, taking any possible view of the case, and nothing under heaven can justify the hot haste of the Synod of South Carolina, in its action taken in the autumn of 1860; and scarcely can we attribute a conceivable motive for this procedure, unless it were to give the earliest possible aid and comfort to that state, which was now starting out on its own fearful mission of treason and rebellion. Such a purpose seems well sustained by the facts. Nothing admits of clearer evidence, of their own showing, than that some of the leading men of our church in that general region were among the foremost in advocating a disruption of the nation. They were so eager for it that they did not tarry for its initiatory forms to be settled in a single State. They did not wait to see what might be the issues of measures, which, upon all reasonable calculations, would inevitably result in an open and bloody civil war. Willing to risk all, they shot ahead of the fiery politicians around them, and staked the fortunes of the church upon the upshot of the disputed dogma of "secession." They counseled secession; they prayed for it; they preached it; they longed for it and labored for it; they rejoiced over and gloried in it; and as a most natural consequence, some of these same men of the church have taken up arms and are fighting for it. Had these prominent men—standing forth for the true and the right with genuine Christian heroism, to which they should have been impelled by every principle of reason and Scripture, and by the demands of their sacred vocation and official position—used as valiantly their influence against as they did for this astounding treason, we verily believe the political leaders would not have been able to carry out their wicked designs with the people. But, at the very outset, they cast the whole weight of their social, religious, and official power into the opposite scale, sustained and encouraged political demagogues, and they are, therefore, before earth and heaven conspicuously responsible for secession and all its horrible consequences, the full sense of which no one can foresee.

Disruption itself, of the church, even though initiated under circumstances of less indecent haste, would have been, if there were not the most amply justifying causes, a schism of stupendous magnitude—always a sin of deep dye in the light of the divine word; but as it actually occurred, all its accompaniments and alliances stamp it with peculiar wickedness.

As to the *causes* which operated to produce the division of the church, they were the same substantially which led to the disrupture of the nation; and hence the secret of the eagerness of the leading men of the church to identify its fortunes with those of the state. Taking the testimony of the chief actors in both spheres, and all the causes are reducible to one. The highest authority among their statesmen makes slavery “the corner stone” of their new system of government, and boasts that it stands without a parallel in the history of mankind; while it was to secure this element of their social and political life from the apprehended harm to which a longer continuance in the Federal Union would expose it, that they determined to withdraw from the Union. This view, engendered proximately by the result of a presidential election, led to the fatal step. The leading men of the church, partaking of this apprehension, at once resolved on a course for the church, corresponding to what their politicians were about taking for the state. And the leaders of both classes have formally presented these apprehensions to the public, and appealed to mankind for justification in sundering both the political and ecclesiastical ties which bound us together as one, declaring it to be, in the language of one of the most eloquent divines among them, “the providential mission of the South to conserve, perpetuate, and extend” that institution which they make “the corner stone” of their system.

Or, give them the full benefit of their own putting of the case in another form, as we have seen it stated, the ground on which is based the justification of this twin disruption, was the long growing antagonism between the northern and southern portions of the church and of the country upon the subject of slavery; and yet, an antagonism for which those in rebellion are chiefly responsible, springing out of the notorious fact of a radical and total revolution in their opinions on the subject, the extreme southern portion of the church and

of the country having forsaken the doctrines of the fathers which were cherished by men of the church and the world alike both north and south, and having made, for years past, strenuous exertions to improve their newly-discovered wisdom through demands for slavery, which had never before been dreamed of by any men in any stage of our history. In a word, the underlying cause of this whole movement in church and state, the chief actors themselves being witnesses, was to gain immunities, safeguards, guaranties, expansion, and perpetuity, to an institution which the very measures taken for these ends are destined to destroy, and that speedily; and along with its destruction, to carry desolation to every material and social interest of the people inaugurating the plot. Such is the short-sightedness of human wisdom, such the madness of human folly, and such the circumventing providence and avenging hand of an All-seeing God!

But while we record all this, and record it with pain and mortification, and while this stupendous schism of ten synods and forty-four presbyteries, with honorable exceptions of individual members—whether we take it as affecting simply the integrity of Christ's church, in all its interests in this land for time present and to come, or take it in its indelible history as early instigating and closely allied with all the progress what the Narrative justly terms an "atrocious rebellion" within the state—stands forth a gigantic iniquity; still we cheerfully bow to this as a dispensation of providence, to be overruled, as we believe, to glorious ends for the purification both of the church and the nation, and leave the unwilling agents of this work, who "mean not so," in the hands of God to reap the fruit of their doings.

Some have thought that the General Assembly should have pronounced directly upon the schism, and condemned it. We think otherwise. The church has spoken out plainly and manfully, again and again, upon the rebellion, and upon the church as concerned in it through the agency of influential ministers and members. There let the matter rest. As for the schism, let it stand rebuked by a simple purgation of the roll. Let it, with all its concomitants, go down together to posterity in its true character, upon the naked issue made, and there can be but one judgment among those who shall

come after us—that the deeds of men with whom “we took sweet counsel and walked unto the house of God in company,” by their eagerly uniting schism with treason and rebellion, go largely toward making up that fearful record of crime, written in tears and agony and blood—and not even yet fully written—which marks the darkest page in the annals of human history!

ART. III.—STUDIES ON THE BIBLE, No. V. *Israel in the Wilderness.**

WHEN the Hebrews left the land of Egypt and filed off into the wilderness of the Red Sea, it is right to imagine that the mind of Moses was occupied with the painful contrast between the spiritual position and the moral obliquity of the moving hosts before him. By position, as he well knew, they composed the church of the living God. Jehovah had said to him “Israel is my son, even my first-born;” “Say unto the children of Israel, I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you for a God.” Ex. iv: 22, vi: 7. In the Book of Genesis, if it were at that time in writing, Moses had shown that they were the direct heirs of the covenant, whereby Abraham and his posterity were set apart as the chosen seed. Beyond all doubt the church of God was then in existence, and

*HELPS TO THE STUDY.—*Arabia Petræa*. Robinson's Researches, Vol. I. Stanley's Sinai and Palestine. Colenso's Pent., Part I: 118–137. Green's Reply, 86–102. Benisch's do., 29–59.

The Pillar of Cloud: Kurtz, ii: 344. Palfrey's Lectures, i: 149. Bush on Exodus, ii: 164–293. Fairbairn, ii: 77. Calvin, Rosenmüller, Von Gerlach, etc., on Exodus.

The Passage of the Red Sea: Robinson's Res., i: 57. Kitto's Cycl., Art. Exodus. Kurtz, ii: 352. Smith's Dict. Bib., Art. Exodus. N. Brit. Rev., Nov., 1857: 279.

The Manna: Kurtz, iii: 25–44. Fairbairn, ii: 61. Stanley's Jewish Church, 162.

The Smitten Rock: Kurtz, iii: 47. Tacitus' Hist., B. 5 § 3. 4. Oldshansen, Hodge, etc., on 1 Cor. x: 4.

Amalek: Kurtz, iii: 48. Calvin's Com.

Typology: Fairbairn, Witsius' Cov'ts., Ernesti on Interpre.

was to be found, not among the Egyptians or the Amalekites or the Canaanites, but in the bosom of the Hebrew race. That race was, to use the language of Stephen the proto-martyr, "the church in the wilderness." Acts vii: 38. On the other hand, none had a keener sense than Moses of their delinquencies. There were holy men and women among them, such as Caleb, Joshua, and Miriam. But, with few exceptions, these "hosts of the Lord" were unworthy the name they bore. They had worshiped the gods of Egypt; they were in a great measure ignorant of the true God, and fatally corrupted by contact with the foul iniquities of Egypt. Long years of oppression had exhausted their manliness and courage, so that their own servility and unbelief had presented obstacles to their emancipation not less formidable than the obstinacy of Pharaoh. By what means shall their ignorance be enlightened, their passion for the worship of false gods be extirpated, and a complete reformation of public morals effected? God is able of the stones to raise up children unto Abraham; by what agencies will he work a transformation not less wonderful upon the degenerate seed of the patriarch?

The perils of the wilderness were also well known to Moses. The whole region was infested by barbarous and warlike tribes: Edom, Amalek, Moab, and Ammon. And, what was far more appalling, a vast and burning waste was before them, in which there was neither food nor water sufficient for so great a multitude. A few palm trees of the date bearing species were here and there to be found. Ex. xv: 27. The traveler might occasionally purchase from the native tribes small quantities of food and water. Deut. ii: 6, 28; Num. xx: 19. Possibly a few wells might be dugged in the desert of Moab. Num. xxi: 14-18. The Hebrews took with them also their flocks and herds. Ex. xii: 32. If, as is commonly estimated, one hundred or a hundred and fifty thousand male lambs and kids of the first year were required for the celebration of the Passover at Sinai, the sheep and goats alone of the Hebrews must have numbered nearly two millions; furnishing, to a certain extent, milk and flesh for food, and leather, wool, and hair for clothing. But according to Moses himself, these flocks and herds, if slain, would hardly suffice the people for a single month. Num. xi: 22. Besides, how were these

flocks to be supported in the wilderness? Moses had found pastures for the sheep of his father-in-law among the valleys of Mount Horeb—Ex. iii: 1; but what were these few sheep compared with the vast herds of the Hebrews? And how were they to be sustained in the barren and waterless wastes of the desert of Paran?

The extent to which the wilderness furnished, in its natural productions, food for the Hebrews and forage for their cattle, can not perhaps be accurately determined. On the one hand, it is estimated that the population of the entire desert does not, at present, exceed five thousand souls: and the support which these obtain is exceedingly meager, although it is eked out by the perquisites and the plunder obtained from travelers. On the other hand, it is alleged that the region was anciently far more productive than at this time. Dr. Benisch, the eminent Jewish scholar, in his masterly reply to Colenso, adverts to the fact that Moses cast the dust, to which he had ground the golden calf, “into a brook that descended out of the mount.” Deut. ix: 21. This occurred in the month of August, a season of the year when, as things now are, the beds of the mountain torrents are wholly dry. Dr. B. suggests that the same causes which produced one stream must have produced many others, and with them extensive pasture grounds, the whole indicating a thorough change in the meteorological conditions, and in the productiveness of the region. But these conclusions are liable to be invalidated by the presumption that the “brook which descended out of the mount” was, probably, the same that flowed, miraculously, from the stricken rock in Horeb.

There are, however, indications in Scripture of a certain degree of fertility at the time of the Exodus, in some parts of the desert. The Hebrews found pastures for their cattle near Mount Sinai, in midsummer, a period when, in modern times, the plains and wadys are almost wholly destitute of vegetation. Still further, numerous and powerful tribes dwelt in the wilderness. Moses speaks in general terms of “the nations” through the domains of which the Hebrews passed in their journey. Deut. xxix: 16. Amalek, Midian, and Edom are mentioned by name. The numerical strength of the Amalekites is expressed by several circumstances. Although

their home was along the border of Palestine, their warriors attacked the Hebrews at a point as far to the South as Rephidim, near Mount Sinai; and so formidable was the onslaught that Moses betook himself to prayer for divine assistance, Aaron and Hur holding up his hands. At a later period, Saul raised an army of not less than 210,000 men for the purpose of making war upon this tribe. Now from the greatness of the tribe, the inference is direct to the comparative fertility of the desert. This inference is strengthened by the fact that "Saul smote the Amalekites from Havilah until thou comest to Shur which is before Egypt." 1 Sam. xv: 7. This pursuit would have been extremely difficult if not impossible, if the region had been as desolate then as now; and as appears from the history of Napoleon's forced march from Cairo to Jaffa, in 1799; and the retreat of Ibrahim Pasha from Syria, in 1840. To this may be added the indications of former fertility which still linger in the desert. Ritter, whose authority is very high, finds traces "of a more universal and thorough cultivation of the soil, in former times, which reveals itself in the period of the most ancient Egyptians by their mining operations and settlements, and in the Christian period by Episcopal foundations, and the remains, which are scattered everywhere, of cloisters, hermitages, gardens, fields, and wells." (Green against Colenso, p. 95.) These circumstances enter into the right solution of the problem as to the subsistence of the flocks driven by the Hebrews into the wilderness. Some persons who do not doubt the miracle by which the people were fed, do yet hesitate upon the point of the feeding of their cattle by a divine interposition. These persons may find some contentment in the evidence now produced showing that the springs, and wells, and oases, and pastures of the wilderness were, at one time, more frequent and constant than now. But others less timid, who bear in mind the fact that water was miraculously supplied at Horeb and at Kadesh, both for the congregation "and their beasts also," will not doubt that God who hears the ravens when they cry, was able to open pastures in the wilderness and "turn the dry ground into water springs." Ps. cvii: 35.

But, although the truth of history requires that a candid estimate be formed of the natural resources of the wilderness,

all the facts point steadily to the conclusion that the region, as a whole, was utterly desolate. It was, according to the record, a "waste howling wilderness; a land of deserts and of pits, a land of drought and the shadow of death, a land that no man passed through, and where no man dwelt." Deut. xxxii: 10; Jer. ii: 6. Compare Num. xx: 4, 5; Deut. viii: 15. The Hebrews, having experienced the reluctant hospitalities of the country, were in perpetual terror lest they should perish with hunger and thirst, and repeatedly murmured against Moses and against God who had brought them out into the wilderness to die there. And even Moses, when Jehovah promised to give the people meat for a month, replied incredulously, "Shall the flocks and the herds be slain for them, to suffice them? or shall all the fish of the sea be gathered together for them, to suffice them?" Num. xi: 22.

The foregoing observations indicate the two vital points in the history of Israel in the wilderness. The first brings into view their moral debasement, and raises the inquiry how were they made fit for their calling and destiny? The second takes into account the perils of the wilderness, and raises the inquiry how were the people led safely to the promised land? The history turns, therefore, upon the course of divine grace and the course of divine providence by which the spiritual reformation, and the preservation, day by day, of the chosen seed were effected.

From Rameses, in Egypt, whence the Hebrews took their departure, by the way of the river Arish and the city of Gaza to Hebron, is less than two hundred and fifty miles; a journey which might have been easily made by the Israelites in forty days. Travelers from Cairo to Jaffa usually take with them provisions for twelve days; Napoleon marched his army from Cairo to El Arish, about one hundred and fifty miles, in less than six days. The hostility of the Philistines, who dwelt about Gaza, rendered this route impracticable. This hostility took its rise, perhaps, from a foray, made by the sons of Ephraim during their residence in Egypt, upon Philistia, for the purposes of plunder. 1 Chron. vii: 20-24. For this reason "God led them not through the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near: for God said, Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return

to Egypt." Ex. xiii: 17. It was, moreover, the purpose of God to reveal his law to Israel shortly after the exodus, and to that end he had determined to assemble them at Sinai. But even this circuitous route would not, by its measured length, have detained them many months in the wilderness. The journey from Cairo, by the way of Mount Sinai to Jerusalem, may be accomplished, with camels or mules, in less than sixty days, the traveler giving himself ample time to satisfy everywhere his curiosity. It was, however, a part of the divine plan to detain the people, for the purposes of instruction, discipline, and purification, forty years in the wilderness.

The duration of the sojourn was determined by an incident in the disgraceful revolt at Kadeshbarnea. The twelve spies that were sent from that post into the land of Canaan were absent forty days. After hearing the evil report which ten of these spies brought back, the people refused to go up and take possession of the promised land. Jehovah, in his anger, turned the whole congregation back into the wilderness for the period of forty years—one year for every day in which the unfaithful spies searched the land. Num. xiv: 33, 34. Now it is not difficult to ascertain the ends which were answered by this long wandering.

In the first place, time was given for the old wayward race to pass from life, and give place to a new and better generation. Their bondage in Egypt had engendered within them a weak and cowardly spirit. When Pharaoh and his hosts pressed upon their encampment near the Red Sea, they insulted Moses with the cowardly taunt—"Is not this the word that we did tell thee in Egypt, saying, Let us alone, that we may serve the Egyptians; for it had been better for us to serve the Egyptians than that we should die in the wilderness?" Ex. xiv: 12. At Kadesh, when the spies described "the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants" whom they had seen in Canaan, the Hebrews, like a mob of panic-stricken runaways, "lifted up their voice and cried; and the people wept that night." Num. xiv: 1. It would have been impossible for such a rabble of poltroons to move upon Jericho and Ai, to storm the intrenched cities of Canaan, and to take military possession of the country. They were, moreover, idolatrous, ungodly and sensual. At Marah,

because the waters were bitter, they murmured against Moses. In the wilderness of Sin, because they were hungry, they said: "Would God we had died by the hand of the Lord in the land of Egypt, when we sat by the flesh pots, and did eat bread and were full." Ex. xvi: 3. In Rephidim, because they were thirsty, they chided Moses and tempted Jehovah, saying: "Wherefore is this, that thou has brought us up out of Egypt, to kill us, and our children, and our cattle, with thirst?" Ex. xvii: 3. At Sinai, like so many wild Chaldeans, they went "mad upon their idols," and danced to the music of calf-worship. The names given to their camping-grounds, beyond Sinai, perpetuated, at once, their iniquities and sufferings. The fire of the Lord burnt among them for their murmurings, and they called the name of the place Burning; then the children of Israel wept again, and lusted for flesh, and said: Who will give us flesh to eat? and God sent quails into the camp, and the pestilence with the quails, so that they called the place the Graves of Lust. Num. xi: 1-34. Finally, at Kadesh, their ignominy became complete. The problem of this pusillanimous and godless generation admitted of but one solution. That solution was thus expressed by the Almighty: "As for you, your carcasses, they shall fall in this wilderness." Num. xiv: 32. Forty years afforded ample time for the execution of this righteous judgment. Meanwhile, a more resolute and hardy, a more faithful and godly race, came forward in the persons of their children. They escaped the effeminacy of Egypt, and the cowardliness commonly engendered by a state of servitude; they were inured to hardship and self-denial by their life in the desert; they were trained to warlike habits and soldierly discipline by their conflicts in arms with the Bedouins who harassed their march, and so were prepared for the wars of the conquest. Their spiritual discipline was not neglected. Separated, by the deserts and the seas, from the idolatrous Egyptians on the west, and the foul and filthy inhabitants of Canaan on the north; held aloof, also, from the native tribes of the wilderness, by reciprocal animosity, they were alone with Jehovah. They saw all his mighty works. He walked with them in the pillar of cloud, he fed them with manna, and gave them water out of the sweetened fountain or the smitten rock:

his tabernacle was with them, together with his holy priesthood and daily sacrifices; his smiles rewarded their obedience, and his judgments avenged their presumptuous sins. This discipline was complete and effectual. Never, in the history of the world, has a change so radical been wrought upon a people in forty years; never did two successive generations contrast each other more thoroughly than the sons who crossed the Jordan, and the fathers who crossed the Red Sea. Those who left Egypt were, as has been seen, in hopeless apostasy; those who entered Canaan composed, perhaps, one of the purest of all the generations of Israel, from Abraham to Christ. Deut. viii: 2-5; Josh. xxiv: 14-31; Jer. ii: 2, 3.

In the second place, opportunity was afforded in the course of forty years for the education of the Hebrews in the usages of the ceremonial law. The Mosaic institutes were to the Hebrews, considered as a civil commonwealth, a written constitution, a body of common law and the statutes at large—all complete. These institutes embraced also a confession of faith, a directory for worship, a form of government, and a book of discipline for the people, considered as a church; these were also perfect to their end, and the whole is condensed within the smallest possible compass. It is, by far, the most comprehensive and compact, the most thoroughly excogitated and nicely-adjusted code of civil and ecclesiastical law ever produced. The ceremonial law, which is but one member of the general system, is, in itself, both complete and complicated. Complete it is, because it provides fully for the four parts of worship, the sanctuary, the priesthood, the ritual, and the kalender; that is to say, it prescribes the place, the officers, the forms and the times of divine worship. It is complicated, also, as he who has most carefully considered the subject, in all its parts and relations, best knows. Most of those who have gone into the investigation, have failed for lack of ability or patience to master the system. Indeed, the labors of both Rabbinical and Christian scholars, continued through the ages, have not yet produced a satisfactory treatise on the Jewish ceremonial law. The Jewish divines have not duly estimated Christianity, in which the ceremonial law obtained its highest expression, and the Christian divines have not duly considered Judaism in which

Christianity took its beginning. Very few of them have appreciated the profound remark of Augustine: "The New Testament lies hidden in the Old, the Old is laid open in the New." But it was indispensable that the ceremonies of the law, the due order, method, and sequences of its forms of worship, should be thoroughly understood by the Hebrews. These rites were to be established in Palestine as the usages of the country, they were to express for fifteen hundred years the devout affections of the people, to make up the sum of their religious traditions, to enter as vital forces into the very elements of national life, and to be the chosen vessels bearing the treasures of salvation to the ages to come. It was needful, therefore, that the people be subjected to a course of special and thorough education in the law; and the wilderness afforded the conditions of that protracted education. They were alone, dwelling in those awful solitudes for the period of forty years. Fed by manna from heaven, they were relieved from daily labor and had leisure for the studies set before them. Far away from thronged cities, from the bustle of trade and commerce, from the maddening din of long and dreary wars, never agitated by the restless fever of modern western civilization, or even the gentler and more sluggish movements of oriental society, the chosen seed had but a single serious occupation—the study of the law and attendance upon the solemnities of public worship. The tabernacle was always pitched in the center of the encampment; the brazen altar and the law stood in the open sight of the people; and all things were so arranged as to allow the tribes gathered around the court of the tabernacle to witness the daily course of the ceremonial—the service of the priesthood, the ceaseless oblations, the unquenched fire and the smoke of the victims ascending day and night. They had Moses and Aaron, to whom the law was given, as their ministers, ready to expound the sacred mysteries, and Jehovah himself answered out of the cloud to the prayer of Moses and the elders seeking further knowledge of his holy will. It was a grand school of instruction, on subjects most solemn, taught by masters wise beyond their time, because divinely taught themselves and inspired; the instruction addressing the eye through a bloody but magnificent ritual, and the ear first

through the voice that came out of the cloud, which voice they that heard, entreated that it should not be spoken to them any more, and then afterward through the words that God spoke to Moses and Aaron.

Nor, in the third place, were the heathen forgotten in the providential purposes of the wandering. A map of the wilderness, exhibiting the distribution of its native tribes, will show that the hosts of the Lord marched through the pastures of Midian in the desert of Sinai; they sojourned thirty-eight years among the Amalekites of Paran; they moved along the range of mountains occupied by the inhospitable descendants of Esau; they traversed the plains of Moab and Ammon, and laid their course within the borders of the warring Ammonites. These tribes saw the wonders in the desert—the daily miracle of the manna from heaven was wrought in their presence, and they beheld from afar the pillar of cloud and of fire. The wandering, in its relations to the Bedouins, presented three aspects. The church of God was carried into the bosom of heathen tribes, as before it went to Egypt and long afterward into Babylon. The hostility which most of these tribes displayed toward Israel, furnished a new illustration of the antipathy of the seed of the serpent against the seed of the woman. And what was of more importance, the pagan world received a profound impression of the majesty of the true God. This result was foreshown in the song of Moses at the Red Sea. "The people shall hear and be afraid: sorrow shall take hold on the inhabitants of Palestine. Then the dukes of Edom shall be amazed; the mighty men of Moab, trembling, shall take hold upon them; all the inhabitants of Canaan shall melt away. Fear and dread shall fall upon them." Ex. xv: 15-17. Jethro afterward blessed Jehovah, who had delivered the Hebrews out of the hands of the Egyptians, adding these words: "Now I know that the Lord is greater than all gods." Ex. xviii: 11. The tidings from the wilderness traversed the desert of Arabia as far as the Euphrates, and extorted from Balaam the confession that "God brought them out of Egypt." Num. xxiii: 22. These tidings went before the Israelites into the land of Canaan, at once exalting the name of Jehovah and preparing the way for an easy conquest of the promised land. To the two spies

Rahab said: "We have heard how the Lord dried up the waters of the Red Sea for you, when you came out of Egypt. * * * And as soon as we heard these things, our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more courage in any man because of you; for the Lord your God, he is God in heaven above and in earth beneath," Josh. ii: 10, 11. Compare Num. xxii: 3; xxiii: 18-24; Josh. iv: 23, 24; v: 1.

The miracles that were wrought in the wilderness occupy positions of paramount importance in the inspired record. It is not sufficient to say that they were adapted to the urgent necessities of the wandering Hebrews, were wonderful displays of almighty power, and are, in their leading characteristics, peculiar to this part of biblical history. They were more: they were revelations of the only living and true God exactly suited to the state of the church and the world, they were instruments, powers indeed, in the education and discipline of the chosen seed. Several modern scholars, among whom is Canon Stanley in his *History of the Jewish Church*, have fallen short of the truth, egregiously and lamentably by reason of their having overlooked the supreme efficacy of these miracles as the means of spiritual culture to the Hebrew race, and their supreme importance as self-revelations of the Almighty. Any survey of this period, however admirable in other respects, will be wholly insufficient, if it does not reproduce, in their just proportions, the supernatural features of the history. The most remarkable of these wonders were the pillar of cloud and of fire, the passage of the Red Sea, the rain of bread from heaven, the miraculous supply of water, the defeat of Amalek, the judgments on the Hebrews, and the theophany at Sinai.

Soon after the exodus, there appeared in the camp of Israel a pillar of cloud and of fire. This phenomenon assumed the form of a lofty column, its base approaching, perhaps touching, the surface of the earth, its top rising high into the heavens, opaque by day, luminous by night. Possibly the light was diffused through the mass of the cloud, the whole resembling a distant conflagration, or the torch of a volcano. But it is more probable that an inner column of flaming fire was enveloped by an exterior covering of cloud. The critics have determined its dimensions from Ps. cv: 39, in which it

is written that God spread over the Hebrews "a cloud for a covering," as well as "a fire to give light in the night." According to the current interpretation of that expression, compared with Num. x : 34, and Isa. iv : 5, 6 ; the upper part of the cloud expanded like a canopy, protecting the camp of Israel from the burning sun ; and it is further estimated that the camp itself, containing two millions of persons, with their flocks, usually occupied a space of not less than twelve miles square.

The narrative, fairly interpreted, concludes to the proposition that the cloudy pillar was the dwelling place of Jehovah. The record states in so many words that "the LORD went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire;" "the angel of the LORD (the Jehovah angel) which went before the camp of Israel, removed, and went behind them;" and "the glory of Jehovah appeared in a cloud." Ex. xiii : 21 ; xiv : 19 ; xvi : 10. The substance of the pillar, even flaming fire, was an appropriate symbol of the presence of Jehovah, "for our God is a consuming fire." Heb. xii : 29. Moreover, the central burning splendor was veiled from mortal eyes by the enveloping cloud, even as the Almighty "dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto." 1 Tim. vi : 16. The phenomenon was, therefore, a perpetual vision of God, the culmination of all theophanies of the five hundred years preceding. It followed the wonderful law of progression according to which all the self-revelations of Jehovah have proceeded ; it was a smoking furnace in the vision of Abraham, a burning bush in the presence of Moses, and now a flaming fire, traversing the wilderness, with undimmed majesty, for the space of forty years.

The leading design of the pillar was, undoubtedly, to make manifest, in the midst of the Israelites, the being and glory of Jehovah. Their ignorance of the true God and their proneness to idolatry and polytheism, rendered it necessary that Jehovah should reveal himself to their senses by an open and awful vision ; and that he should demonstrate by his perpetual presence among them that he is a God not afar off but nigh at hand. But in addition to its uses as a revelation of the Almighty, it served many other important purposes. Its movements directed the march of the Israelites. In the place

where the cloud stood still, they pitched their tents; so long as the cloud abode there they rested in their encampments; and when the cloud was taken up, whether by day or by night, they struck their tents, and followed it in all their journeys. Still further, like the shadow of a great rock in a weary land, the Almighty spread the curtains of the cloud over the bleak and burning desert. The holy oracle, too, was established in its bosom. "He spake unto them in the cloudy pillar." Ps. xcix: 7. At the giving of the law, the pillar arose and stood on the summit of Mount Horeb, and Jehovah came down into the midst of it and gave his law to Moses. When the tabernacle was set up, for the first time on the adjacent plain, "the cloudy pillar descended, and stood at the door of the tabernacle, and JEHOVAH talked with Moses." Ex. xxxiii: 9-11. The Almighty appeared again in the cloud to bestow on the seventy elders the spirit of Moses; and as the day drew near on which Moses was to die, the LORD spake with Moses and Joshua from the midst of the cloud. Num. xi: 25; Deut. xxxi: 15.

And that nothing might be wanting to the majesty of this Shekinah, the Almighty set within it his throne of judgment. At the Red Sea, the Divine wrath flashed forth from the bosom of the cloud upon the host of the Egyptians. When Miriam, and at her instigation, Aaron, also, became seditious, God called the malcontents into the bosom of the cloud, and when the cloud departed, "behold, Miriam became leprous, white as snow." Num. xii: 10. Fire went out from the Lord and devoured Nadab and Abihu; and in the rebellion of Korah and his company, a fire came out again and consumed two hundred and fifty of the conspirators. Forty years long, this vision of consummate glory stood in the sight of Israel—at once a revelation and presence-chamber of Jehovah, a guide and canopy by day, a torch and sentinel by night, a holy oracle, and a throne of judgment. When they reached the borders of Canaan, it was taken up out of sight. Throughout the after ages, it was seen but once. At Solomon's temple, in the act of dedication, "the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the LORD, so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud; for the glory of the LORD had filled the house of God." 2 Chron. v: 14.

The rationalists have diligently practiced their arts of critical sorcery on this symbol of the Divine presence. These magicians resolve the glory in which God came down upon Sinai, and in which the Son of Man appeared at the transfiguration, into thunder-storms, and the shining of Moses' face into simple electricity. They see nothing in the first plague but the effects of red clay held in solution by the waters of the Nile, and nothing in the tenth beside a bloody raid of Bedouin Arabs, or a cruel butchery by the hands of the Israelites. According to them, the vision of Zachariah was effected by the smoke of the chandeliers in the temple. The "star which went before the wise men" was a servant bearing a flambeau; and the angels who ministered to Christ, after the temptation, were a caravan of merchants, crossing the desert, laden with provisions. The man restored to sight, by our Saviour, was blinded by dust lodged in his eyes, and cured by washing them in the pool of Siloam. Christ, also, healed the deaf and the dumb by a surgical operation, cleverly performed, while apparently touching the ear or the tongue. And, as for Peter, it is most natural to suppose, considering his assault on Malchus, that he stabbed Ananias and Sapphira with a concealed weapon. These critics have, of course, found but little difficulty in resolving the cloudy pillar into a caravan-fire, such as was used by Alexander in his march across the desert, or into fire-baskets, filled with resinous wood, and carried on long poles at the head of the wandering Hebrews. Toland, the English Deist, gravely conjectures that the pillar was a signal arranged by Hobab, who undertook to guide the march through the wilderness. Stickel is not ashamed to suggest that the signal-fire, which was usually kindled in front of the camp, was, at the Red Sea, by a stratagem of war, transferred to the rear; the result of which was, that the "east-wind," at that moment prevailing, blew the smoke into the faces of the Egyptians, and lighted up the path through the sea before the Israelites; and this is what Moses teaches in Ex. xiv: 19, 20: "the pillar of cloud came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these: so that the one came not near the other all the night."

On the departure of the Hebrews from Rameses, Moses

took the route which would have led him around the head of the Red Sea. But as he approached that point, he suddenly turned his course southward, by the command of the Almighty, and encamped the moving hosts of Israel along the western shore of the sea, putting the sea itself between them and the peninsula of Sinai, and putting them between the sea and their enemies. The intelligence went to Pharaoh that they were "entangled in the land." Ex. xiv: 1-4. Whether the king suspected that Moses had been abandoned to a fatal blunder by his God, or had taken leave of his common sense, is not explained. The record makes known the fact that the stratagem was prepared by the Almighty, and that by the stupenduous miracle at the sea, the judgment of God, which had already laid waste the land of Egypt, falling on the elements of nature, on man and beast, on magicians and idols, and on the first-born of all the heathen, was now summarily and finally executed on Pharaoh and on the flower of his army. When they sunk ignominiously into the depths of the sea, the triumph of God's people and the humiliation of his enemies were complete. The head of the serpent was bruised.

Two questions, incidentally connected with the miracle, require some attention. One of these relates to the exact point at which the passage of the sea was effected, and the other to the supernatural agencies called forth by the emergency. Dr. Edward Robinson and Dr. Kurtz are of opinion that the passage took place at a narrow arm of the sea near Suez. Raumer, Father Sicard, Dr. Olin and others, follow the well-settled traditions of that region, according to which the waters were opened at Ras Atakah, twelve miles below Suez, where the sea is about twelve miles wide, and very deep. In this conflict of authorities, in the absence of exact knowledge as to the topography of the country, and, what is more embarrassing, in the irremediable ignorance of mankind respecting the geological changes which have been wrought upon the shores and shoals of the sea in the run of thirty-five hundred years, it is impossible for the inquirer to reach any incontestable conclusion. It ought, however, to be stated that those whose habits of thought incline them to reduce the supernatural in the transaction to its lowest terms, will inva-

riably determine the question in favor of Suez. For, according to Kurtz, the breadth of the sea at that place is now only eleven hundred and seven yards, although, as he remarks, it may have been wider in the time of Moses. According to Professor Robinson, the broad shoals which are found there are still left bare at ebb-tide; the channel is forded by caravans at very low water; and General Bonaparte and his suite attempted the passage in 1799, although they were exposed to the greatest danger. At this point, the avowed rationalists step in and take up the unhappy parable of these orthodox critics. What, in the hands of Professors Kurtz and Robinson, is semi-miraculous, becomes, in the hands of Palfrey and others, no miracle at all or one of the very faintest type. The record, at Ex. xiv: 22, states that the Israelites "went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground." Palfrey teaches that the Hebrew text means simply "land sufficiently bare of water to walk on." The sea at Suez, according to a fair conclusion from the statements of Kurtz and Robinson, was too narrow and too shallow to receive and drown the hosts of Egypt with their chariots and horses. But the words of Moses are: "There remained not so much as one of them." The explanation of Palfrey is: "We are by no means told that every individual perished. Moses relates what he saw: 'There remained not so much as one of them,' in his view." Still further, if the Hebrews crossed at Suez, why did not the Egyptian cavalry ride swiftly around the head of the sea, only four miles distant, and attack Moses in front as he approached the eastern shore?

In regard to what was supernatural in the transaction, Prof. Robinson's remarks are: "The Lord, it is said, caused the sea to go (or to flow out) *by a strong east wind*. The miracle is therefore represented as mediate; not a direct suspension of, or interference with, the laws of nature, but a miraculous adaptation of those laws to produce a required result. It was wrought by natural means supernaturally applied. For this reason we are entitled to look only for the natural effects arising from the operation of such a cause. In the somewhat indefinite phraseology of the Hebrew, an east wind means any wind from the eastern quarter; and would include the north-east wind, which often prevails in that region. Now it will be

obvious from the inspection of any good map of the gulf, that a strong northeast wind acting here upon the ebb-tide would necessarily have the effect to drive out the waters from the small arm of the sea which runs up by Suez, and also from the end of the gulf itself, leaving the shallow portions dry; while the more northern part of the arm, which was anciently broader and deeper than at present, would still remain covered with water. Thus the waters would be divided, and be a wall (or defense) to the Israelites on the 'right hand and the left.' If, then, as is most probable, the wind thus miraculously sent, acted upon the ebb-tide to drive out the waters during the night to a far greater extent than usual, we still can not assume that the extraordinary ebb, thus brought about by natural means, would continue more than three or four hours at most." Thus far Dr. Robinson. It would be doing great injustice to this eminent scholar—and such injustice were inexcusable now that death has closed his pious labors—to overlook the distinctness with which he affirms the presence of the supernatural, to a certain important extent. But his exalted reputation as a biblical scholar makes it the more necessary that the exceptions to which his opinions are liable, should be distinctly pointed out. To some of these exceptions, taken singly, more weight is to be attached than to others; but their cumulative effect is entitled to consideration. Dr. R. assumes that the sea was opened at Suez, a statement which is vital to his argument; but Moses does not determine that question, and the traditions of the region and some of the best authorities, ancient and modern, designate Ras Atakah as the place of transit. According to the record the wind blew strongly from the east; Dr. R. assumes that it came out of the north-east. The record is silent as to the state of the tide; Dr. R. assumes that the wind was assisted by the ebb-tide. The record contains no intimation as to the portion of the night occupied by the Hebrews in the passage of the sea; Dr. R. assumes that they crossed the sea in four hours, the interval between the ebb and flow of the tide. Lastly, the record states, in terms, that the "waters were a wall on the right hand and the left" and the "floods stood upright as an heap;" Dr. R. assumes that the deeper waters on either side of the shoals were simply "a defense" to the flanks of the Hebrews; that is to say, the

waters, instead of "standing upright as an heap," were in fact blown down by the wind to a lower level than usual. These are not deductions from the word of God; they are assumptions, for the most part gratuitous and even violent, and as such are wholly inadmissible in an argument the effect of which is to exhaust the miracles by which Jehovah honored himself on Pharaoh and all his host.

The sacred writers deal with the subject in a far different spirit. One and all of them treat the cleaving of the sea as a most wonderful display of omnipotence, a stupendous miracle, the appropriate termination of a series of amazing and terrific manifestations of the Almighty. Moses and the children of Israel, in their song of triumph, use language which exceeds the bounds of even poetical license, if it be taken as descriptive of nothing more than an ebb-tide, an easterly wind, and the retreat of the shallow waters from the shoals. They sing: "Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? Who is like thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?" Ex. xv: 4-12. Joshua describes the parting of the Jordan and of the sea as miracles of the same kind. "For the Lord your God dried up the waters of Jordan from before you, until ye were passed over, as the Lord your God did to the Red Sea, which he dried up before us until we were gone over." Josh. iv: 23. It is not pretended that there were either shoals or an ebb-tide at the Jordan. David and Asaph treat the event as one of the "terrible doings" of God; they celebrate the "strength by which He divided the sea; and the "rebuke" by which he dried up the waters. Ps. lxvi: 5, lxxiv: 13, lxxviii: 13, cvi: 9, cxxxvi: 13. Isaiah refers the wonder to the "glorious arm" of Jehovah; and Nehemiah ascribes it no less distinctly to His power. Is. lxiii: 12; Neh. ix: 11. One of two conclusions lies very near the speculations of Professors Robinson and Kurtz: Either the word of God grossly exaggerates the facts, or these critics have well-nigh stripped them of their real significance. Nothing is gained by attempts at conciliating the spirit of destructive criticism. When an evangelical divine puts the miracle at the Red Sea on the basis of natural law, the naturalist improves the advantage and reduces the event to the ordinary competency of wind and tide; then the critic of the school of Bauer resolves

the little that is left into a myth and assigns the Pentateuch and the destruction of Pharaoh to a place in legendary literature side by side with the Æneid and the drowning of Palinurus. The battle is often lost by an abandonment of the outposts.

“They struggle vainly to preserve a part
Who have not courage to contend for all.”

Another miracle of the wilderness was the appearance of the manna. Ex. xvi: 4-26. Num. xi: 7, 8. The critics who reject the church doctrine of plenary inspiration and of the supernatural, have found this part of the narrative peculiarly unmanageable. Canon Stanley, an adept in the critical arts of the Broad church party, dismisses the subject with a few vague remarks and some pretty lines from Keble's "Song of the manna-gatherers." This attempt to shift the subject from the region of history to that of poetry, may please the fancy, but will hardly satisfy the love of truth. Here are two millions of people, of whom fourteen hundred thousand are old men, women, and children, with cattle estimated at two millions; they strike out boldly into the interior of Arabia Petræa; they wander in the deserts forty years. Now, how were they fed?—that is the question. Those who are familiar with the movements of modern armies can appreciate the difficulties of the problem. When a few thousand men are to be landed on the enemy's coast, in addition to the ships employed to convey the troops, the wide sea is almost covered with transports bearing the *materiel* of war. In the month of September, 1862, General Buell moved the Federal army of about fifty thousand men, from Huntsville to Louisville. The region through which he passed is, as a whole, very productive, yet his wagon train was said, at the time, to be twenty miles long. General Lee recently marched into Pennsylvania at the head of a Confederate army, estimated at from seventy-five to one hundred and twenty thousand men; his train, according to the newspapers, contained several thousand wagons. Now if these campaigns, of from fifty to one hundred and twenty thousand men, conducted in fertile regions and finished in thirty days, be compared with the movement of two millions of people, along a burning waste, and continued through forty

years; or if the melancholy history of Napoleon's march of six days, with only ten thousand men, from Cairo to El Arish, be considered in its bearings on the case, a problem emerges which Mr. Stanley will scarcely solve by poetical numbers, however smoothly they may flow. This sojourn in the wilderness is to be accounted for, and rationalism gains nothing by denying or quietly ignoring the miracle of the manna, while it leaves the facts unexplained.

Some of the German critics have put a bold face upon the matter, and denied out and out that the Hebrews crossed the desert. But whence came those indelible traces of the wandering which are left upon the whole body of Hebrew tradition and literature? Even Ewald, one of the boldest rationalists of his generation, holds that the truth of the journey must be admitted, or the truth of the after-history denied. Hitzig meets the difficulty by reducing the forty years to four; and Van Bohlen amends Hitzig's proposition by striking out four and inserting two. But how was the vast and helpless throng sustained even two years in the desert? Colenso, by different applications of his elastic rule-of-three, reduces the numbers of the Israelites first to fifty-seven, then to sixteen, and finally to eight thousand. Laborde brings the six hundred thousand down to six hundred armed men. Stanley leaves the question to "the critical analysis of the text and the probabilities of the case." But how was it possible for a few thousand slaves to escape from Egypt and achieve the conquest of Canaan? Others still weakly suggest that the natural manna of the desert, the production of the tarfa shrub, supplied the people with food. But, according to Burkhardt, the quantity of manna collected in a single year, over the whole peninsula, does not exceed six hundred pounds; and, according to Kurtz, the tarfa shrub is not found in the part of the desert where the people were detained for thirty-eight years. And, furthermore, the true manna fell upon the ground as well as upon the plants; that which remained ungathered dissolved in the heat of the sun; if kept beyond one day it became corrupt; a double quantity fell on the sixth day; none fell on the seventh; that which was gathered on the sixth remained sweet and wholesome through the seventh day; and a portion laid up in the ark of the cov-

enant remained undecayed for ages. If the inquiry be determined by the record, it is impossible to torture the element of the supernatural out of the transaction. If it be determined by the nature of the case, it is certain, that the journey could not have been made, unless the Almighty had fed the people by an open miracle. If the miracle be denied, then the sojourn of two millions of people forty years in the desert, must be denied out and out, or, as an alternative, reduced to the rapid march of a small caravan of Hebrews from Egypt to Canaan. The effect of this mode of criticism will be to dwarf the whole history, before and after, into insignificant proportions. For, if only a few hundred Israelites emigrated from Egypt, then their long sojourn and numerical increase in that land, their enslavement, the ten wonders wrought for their emancipation, and the dividing of the Red Sea, can be nothing more than pleasant but feeble legends; the pillar of fire shrinks into the dimensions of a bonfire; the theophany of Sinai subsides into a thunder-storm, and the passage of the Jordan and the conquest of Canaan, take their places in the chronicles of romance. It is only when the history, as it is written in the Pentateuch, is accepted as veritable history, its unities all observed, and its philosophy truly expounded, that the whole assumes its proper proportions and due relations. Then it is seen that the miracle of the manna supplied at once the physical and spiritual wants of the people; and it fed them day by day, and it made known day by day the supremacy, the eternal power and Godhead of Jehovah. In like manner the miracle of the loaves and fishes fed the hungry and revealed the Son of God.

The scarcity of water in the wilderness called for repeated instances of the divine interposition. There were springs of water along the course of the journey, and wells were occasionally digged. But at one of the stations the water was bitter, and was miraculously sweetened. Subsequently the rock on the side of Horeb, smitten by the rod of Moses, and again, in the last year of the wandering, the rock at Kadesh gave forth water abundantly for the congregation and their herds. The memory of these miracles outlived many generations, and found expression in the psalmody of David and the prophecy of Isaiah. The song of David is, "He opened the rock, and the waters gushed out; they ran in dry places like

a river." Ps. cv: 41. The words of Isaiah are: "They thirsted not when he led them through the deserts: he caused the waters to flow out of the rock for them; he clave the rock also, and the waters gushed out." Is. xlviii: 21. And yet Lipsius can see nothing in the gushing rock besides "the sparkling and pleasant fountain of Wady Feiran;" and critics there are who make good their escape from the testimony of Moses, David, and Isaiah in the whimsical story of Tacitus, to the effect that the Jews, on their escape from Egypt, were thoroughly exhausted for the want of water; Moses, however, observed a herd of wild asses climbing to the top of a rock covered with trees; he followed them, and found a well with a copious supply of water; this led him to set up the image of an ass to be worshiped in the holy place.

Not less decisive was the interposition of Jehovah when the Amalekites attacked the Hebrews at Rephidim. This onslaught took its alarming proportions not only from the numbers and boldness of the Bedouins, but from the fact that they fell upon the exhausted and unprotected rear of the Israelites. "Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way, when ye were come forth out of Egypt; how he did meet thee by the way and smote the hindmost of thee, even all that were feeble behind thee, when thou wast faint and weary; and he feared not God." Deut. xxv: 17, 18. The scattered condition of the armed forces of Israel, together with the atheism of the heathen, rendered it needful that Jehovah should himself appear upon the field. Moses ordered Joshua to lead a column of picked men against the enemy, while he himself took his rod and went up to the top of a hill with Aaron and Hur. Ex. xvii: 8-16. According to the well-settled opinion of the church, the hands of Moses were lifted up in the act of intercession; and the incident is one of the most signal examples in the Old Testament of the power of prayer, falling as such into the same class with the wrestling of Jacob, the face of Elijah bowed between his knees on Carmel, the tears of Hezekiah, and the supplications of Daniel. But the rationalists have taught that Moses did nothing more than hold up his well-known staff as a battle-standard for the purpose of inspiring his forces with courage and hope. Kurtz agrees with these critics in the opinion that the attitude of

Moses was not that of prayer; but he adds, that the display of the staff, by which so many miracles had been wrought, was a signal from Jehovah to Israel, assuring them of his presence and of their certain triumph. Calvin, with his usual discernment, suggests that God had chosen Moses "as intercessor to conquer the enemies from afar, by the stretching forth of his rod, and by his secret earnestness in prayer."

On several occasions, moreover, God inflicted chastisements upon the people, after methods strictly supernatural. At Taberah, the fire of the Lord burnt among them; at the Graves of Lust, the plague raged in the camp; at Hazeroth, Miriam was smitten with leprosy; shortly afterward, the earth opened and swallowed up Korah and his company, fire from the Lord consumed two hundred and fifty of the conspirators, and a plague destroyed several thousands of their partisans; in the fortieth year of the wandering, the Lord scourged them with fiery serpents; and finally, on the plains of Moab, twenty thousand perished by the pestilence, in punishment for idolatry and whoredom. These were not ordinary visitations of God, for the property of the supernatural is discoverable in them all; either in the judgment itself, as in the fire that came out from the Lord and consumed the guilty, or in the relief afforded, as when the plague was stayed by the burning censer of Aaron, or in both the nature of the calamity and the mode of escape, as in the fiery serpent and the brazen serpent. They were, not less palpably than the pillar of cloud, direct interpositions of Jehovah, revelations of his authority, and instruments in the spiritual discipline of the Israelites.

The most remarkable of all these discoveries of the Almighty was made in the awful theophany of Sinai, at the giving of the law. It is not proposed to spread upon these pages the details of this transaction. No exposition of the record can throw new light upon the great events themselves, nor give effect to its own simple but sublime descriptions of the scene. Nor is it needful to waste breath upon the preposterous efforts of the naturalists to explain the facts by the phenomena of nature and the laws of legendary composition. The scene itself made impressions so vivid and enduring upon the Hebrew mind, that it passed down, as a living power, to all the generations, creating and shaping the sentiments and

emotions, the passions also of the race. The psalmists, the early and later prophets, took impressions from Sinai scarcely less vivid than the men who were terrified by the open and awful vision and voice of Jehovah. The law itself, and the sensible manifestations of Jehovah's presence from out which it was given, were wonderful revelations of the only living and true God.

On a review of the wonders wrought in the wilderness it may be said, first, that they were precisely adapted to the immediate exigencies of the people. The interposition at the Red Sea delivered them from the vengeance of Pharaoh: the cloudy pillar led them safely along their intricate and perilous way; manna from heaven fed them; water from the smitten rock refreshed them; the prayer of Moses and his uplifted rod defeated the Amalekites; the rebukes of the Almighty corrected the people for their iniquities; and the vision of Sinai awed them into submission to one of the most onerous and inflexible systems of government and worship ever imposed on any nation. These wonders, like the miracles of Christ, and indeed like all the miracles of the Bible, were, not one of them, intended for mere effect; none was simply a discovery of God's presence and power; but every one was answerable to some grave emergency in the history of the chosen seed. Secondly, their variety is worthy of notice. God did not, he never does, repeat himself. The boundless resources of omnipotent power were used to accomplish the purposes of infinite wisdom. Effects thoroughly opposite to each other were produced. The same pillar of cloud was darkness to the Egyptians and gave light to the Hebrews. Fiery serpents bit the people, and the bitten were healed by looking at the serpent of brass. At one time the Almighty piled up the waves of the Red Sea into a wall, like solid masonry, and at another he "turned the flint into a fountain of waters." Ex. xv: 8; Ps. cxiv: 8.

When Egypt's king God's chosen tribe pursued,
In crystal walls the admiring waters stood;
When through the desert wild they took their way,
The rocks relented and poured forth a sea:
What limit can Almighty goodness know
When seas can harden and when rocks can flow?

[Unknown.]

Thirdly, some of these miracles were continuous. The other wonders, both of the Old and New Testaments, terminated, for the most part, in a single act of power. The mighty works of Christ, even the greatest of them all, his resurrection from the dead, were begun and finished in a moment. But the manna fell in the wilderness six days out of seven, and the pillar of cloud and fire abode day and night with the camp through the period of forty years. Finally, these works were an important part of the teaching and discipline by which the Hebrews were trained for their calling and destiny as the church of God. They brought home to the people the primary lesson of the being, unity and supremacy of Jehovah, the supplementary lesson that he is a God not afar off but nigh at hand; the further truth that Judaism was the only true religion, the only way of salvation, and the final truth that Israel was the Church of God, and as such was at once the object of his infinite mercies and of his sore rebukes, holding the word of grace in sacred trust for the whole race of human kind. Moses summed it all up in these words: "And thou shalt remember all the way which the LORD thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee, and to prove thee, to know what was in thine heart, whether thou wouldest keep his commandments or no. And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live. Thy raiment waxed not old upon thee, neither did thy foot swell, these forty years. Thou shalt also consider in thine heart, that as a man chasteneth his son, so the LORD thy God chasteneth thee." Deut. viii: 2-5.

The general design of this part of biblical history has now been pointed out. It was intended to show how the Almighty, working in a supernatural way, accomplished a twofold purpose: the transfer of the hosts of Israel from Egypt to Canaan, and their spiritual renovation. This plan undoubtedly regulated the composition of the narrative. But the record sets forth some other truths, which, though subordinate to its main design, ought not to be overlooked. It is

so constructed, in the first place, as to humble both the inordinate pride and inordinate self-righteousness of the Jews. The pride of a distinguished ancestry, a sentiment common to mankind, amounted almost to a hateful passion in the bosom of the Jew. The character and position of their patriarchs was a title to distinction and an excuse for superciliousness which were supposed to be indisputable. Their self-righteousness also amounted almost to a disease. They ascribed the act of God, by which they had become the chosen seed, to their own merits. They were blessed above every other people simply because they were better than any other people. They expressed their charity toward the Gentile in the taunt, "Stand by, for I am holier than thou;" they expressed their humility before God in the prayer, "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are." Now, in the Book of Genesis Moses shows that Abraham's kindred, and probably Abraham himself, in early life were idolators. He records, also with judicial impartiality, the inexcusable sins of Abraham after his divine call, the sins of the other pilgrim fathers, of the twelve patriarchs, and of their descendants in Egypt. In the Books of Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, Moses describes minutely the disobedience, idolatry, cowardice, lust, and whoredoms of the people in the wilderness. He relates also with historical justice, the sins of the men and women in the leading and influential families; the weakness of Aaron in the matter of the golden calf, and the childish jealousy of Miriam in the matter of Moses' wife, by which she was led to contrive a conspiracy against her brother. Nor does Moses, the historian, spare Moses, the transgressor; for he relates, with perfect simplicity, the acts of distrust and arrogance, in punishment of which both Aaron and himself were shut out of Canaan. Num. xx: 12. The genealogy of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, is carefully traced back to Levi and Reuben; this being done, Moses gives an account of the plot into which they entered "with two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown," and he proceeds to expose their treason and sacrilege, and to relate their condign punishment. He does not conceal the whoredom of the people in Moab, nor the pestilence which swept off twenty-four thousand of the guilty men, nor the

sentence of the Almighty ordering the "heads of the people," that is to say, the princes, if the passage is to be taken in its obvious sense, "to be hanged up before the LORD against the sun." Num. xxv: 4. Indeed, Moses went still further than even this: he was careful to preserve the names of the spies who were sent to search the land of Canaan, and who brought back a lying and cowardly report. These were "heads of the children of Israel," one from each tribe. And, in the after ages, multitudes of the Jews were compelled, by the evidence of their genealogical tables, to recognize, as their direct ancestors, these dishonored men. Could any blows more telling be planted in the very front of a flushed and arrogant national pride? could any argument be more complete and cogent against the pretension that the Jews, as a nation, had obtained their exalted position as a reward of their exalted virtues?

The record is so constructed, in the second place, as to disclose the reasons why God, for about forty years, suffered the manners of the Hebrews in the wilderness. It is a fair question, why did God so long endure the lawlessness and insolence of these people? why did he not exterminate them, or cast them out among the heathen, and raise up from some other race a better seed? One answer to these questions is to be recognized in the general long suffering and patience of God toward the apostate family of man. Num. xiv: 18. Another reply is exhibited in the covenant made with Abraham, and renewed, from time to time, through the period of four hundred years, wherein the Almighty had sworn to bring this very people into the land of Canaan. Truly, Jehovah is a covenant-keeping God! A third reason for this forbearance is disclosed in the memorable interview between Jehovah and Moses, reported in the fourteenth chapter of Numbers. The Almighty, wearied out at last with the indignities put upon him by the Israelites, said to Moses: "I will smite them with the pestilence, and disinherit them, and will make of thee a greater nation, and mightier than they." The reply of Moses was, perhaps, the noblest act of his life. Modestly and reverently he put the offered glory away from himself and his family, the consummate glory which crowns the ancestral head of a mighty nation, and besought the Lord,

for the honor of his own blessed name, not to destroy the people. The Egyptians, he said, and all the heathen that have heard the fame of Jehovah will speak, saying: "Because the Lord was not able to bring this people into the land which he swore unto them, therefore he hath slain them in the wilderness." The prayer of Moses and its great argument prevailed; and God said: "I have pardoned according to thy word." The results of this intercession were remarkable. God sentenced the adult generation to die in the wilderness, and promised anew to bring their children into Canaan, and so he kept his covenant, and upheld the honor of his name. As for Moses, who declined, under the impulses of piety and patriotism, to accept the imperial gift, he died, also, in the wilderness; and his family lingered in obscurity until David conferred some slight distinction upon a portion of his descendants. 1 Chron. xxvi: 25-28. Compare Judges xviii: 30. Jehovah explained it all by the pen of Ezekiel. "I wrought for my name's sake, that it should not be polluted before the heathen, in whose sight I brought them out." Ezek. xx: 9-26. But God intended to use the Hebrew race as the channel of mercy to the whole world; and this may be received as the fourth reason for his forbearance toward them in the wilderness. The Jewish bigot was grievously at fault, who held that the immeasurable blessings of the old covenant were intended to terminate on his own perverse but favored nation. The Gentile scoffer is egregiously at fault when he rejects the divine origin of the old covenant on the pretext that its immeasurable blessings were, in fact, exhausted on a single race, few in numbers, narrow in their institutions, usages, and habits of mind, and hedged in between the Mediterranean and the Jordan. The primal organic law of that covenant, as repeatedly stated by the Almighty to each of the older patriarchs, was: "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Originally chosen were they, multiplied in Egypt, delivered from thralldom there, and preserved amid the perils of the wilderness; to them pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises, whose were the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. But all these

things were done unto them that through them the Gentiles might be saved.

The record is so constructed, in the third place, as to exhibit in the history of the wandering, types of gospel truths and blessings. It would not be possible, without introducing a superfluous topic, to discuss here the general doctrine of typology. One of the rules adopted by the more rigid schools of interpretation is to the effect, that nothing in the Old Testament is to be accepted as strictly typical which is not either declared or assumed to be typical by the Scriptures themselves. Even under this rule, it will be found, that many of the blessings bestowed on Israel in the wilderness, are set to represent the better things of the gospel. Moses and Joshua are plainly declared to be types of Christ. Deut. xviii : 15 ; Zech. iii : 8. The lifting-up of the brazen serpent represented the lifting-up of Christ as the Saviour of the world. John iii : 14. The passage of the sea foreshadowed baptism, whereby the redeemed became disciples of the Lord. 1 Cor. x : 2. The typical character of the manna is pointed out by Christ himself. John vi : 31-59. The older typologists pressed the subject into fanciful analogies. Witsius, for example, teaches that the minute form of the manna was divinely appointed to set forth the truth that Christ was without form or comeliness, its whiteness corresponded to his purity, its sweetness to the delights which he imparts to believers, and the process of grinding, heating, and baking the manna represented the sufferings by which he became "sweet and wholesome food to our souls." All this may be discarded, and the manna be understood as typical simply of that living bread which came down from heaven, in the person and work of Christ. The smitten rock belongs to the same category. "They drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ." 1 Cor. x : 4. According to a Jewish tradition, the rock smitten by Moses actually left its place in Horeb, and rolled along behind the Israelites in their wandering. Some Christian writers teach that, not the rock itself, but its waters flowed after the people in their journey. But the better interpretation is, that Christ himself, the true rock, as the Jehovah-Angel, the God-Revealed, attended the Hebrews in the wilderness and supplied their wants ; he was the

perpetual fountain from which they obtained all needed blessings. According to this explanation, the smitten rock was the type, Christ the rock of living waters, was the antitype; the rock was the spiritual, that is to say, the supernatural source of the stream at Horeb; so he is evermore the redundant fountain of blessings to his disciples; just as he is the vine, the bread of life; just as he is, also, the flesh and the blood, whereof "if a man eat and drink he shall never hunger nor thirst."

Lastly, the narrative presents instructive analogies between the temptations in the wilderness and those experienced by the Son of God. These parallels are not to be insisted on as a part of the essential meaning of the text, but as reflections which are naturally suggested by the history. Now, the temptations in the wilderness were of two kinds. The Israelites tempted God, and were themselves tempted. To tempt God is not merely to try his patience; it is the more presumptuous sin which men commit when they require the Almighty to prove his omnipotence by some instant and open display of his power. Soon after the exodus "the people did chide with Moses and said, 'give us water that we may drink.'" Ex. xvii: 2. The tone of the complaint was offensive to God, therefore the place was called Meribah or Provocation. It was also called Massah, "because they tempted the LORD, saying, 'is the LORD among us or not?'" verse 7. The substance of their saying was, "we will not receive Jehovah as the true God, unless he shall instantly prove himself to be divine. Let him give us water in this waterless desert, and give it at once, and by an open miracle, and then we will believe him." This impious expression of doubt, this insolent challenge of the Almighty, was the precise form of sin by which they tempted God. In this sense the word temptation is used in Ps. xcvi: 8; and in Heb. iii: 8, 9. The literal rendering of the Hebrew text is, "harden not your heart like Meribah (Provocation), like the day of Massah (Temptation), in the wilderness." Compare Deut. vi: 16. Nor was this a sudden or transient impiety; for God said, "they have tempted me now these ten times." Num. xiv: 22. Christ, in his turn, experienced this specific form of temptation. The Pharisees "came forth and began to question with Christ, seeking of him a sign from heaven, tempting him." Mark viii: 11. These men

intended to put him to the test. They required him to prove what had been already made manifest. It was a profane and reviling challenge, and was treated as such by the Master.

The other form of temptation was experienced by the Hebrews themselves. The sins into which they were seduced may be distributed somewhat roughly into three classes: the sins of inordinate appetite and passion, as in their clamor for flesh at the Graves of Lust and their whoredoms in Moab, the sin of idolatry at Sinai, and the sin of unbelief at Kadesh-barnea. In like manner Christ was tempted of the devil. The analogies are significant. Israel, in the lower sense, was God's son, his first-born, even as Christ, in the highest sense, was the only begotten of the Father, the Son of God indeed. Both were in the wilderness when they were tempted. Israel was tempted forty years, Christ forty days. The temptations which happened to both were threefold; to Israel, inordinate desire, idolatry, unbelief; to Christ unbelief, presumption, idolatry. Both were assailed by importunate hunger, and both were tempted to the most desperate of all acts of impiety, idolatry. And, as if to complete and to vindicate at once the soundness of the analogy, the evangelists show that in repelling the tempter Christ repeated passages of Scripture, every one of which is taken from the narrative of the wandering. The remarkable fact, therefore, is that Christ experienced temptation in both its kinds. The audacity of the Hebrews in tempting God was imitated by the Pharisees in their interview with Christ; and he was also tempted of the devil.

ART. IV.—*A Practical Discourse on Christian Beneficence: the Bible Argument.*

THREE principal divine institutions have been given for the government and training of mankind; the family, the church, and the state. Each of them derives its right of existence, and all of its authority, from God. Each of them has been

assigned, by its Divine Author, to a separate and peculiar field of operation. One specific and important department of man's relations has been committed to each of them; and all of them acting, each in its own sphere, but co-operating harmoniously together, embrace, and provide for, the whole of man's temporal and spiritual interests. In their combined action, they fully meet all man's necessities, and supply all his wants. From each, man derives peculiar blessings, which the others can not give; to each, he owes peculiar duties, which he does not owe to the others. And yet it is manifest that the existence and field of operation of these divine institutions, are so intimately connected, that the condition and circumstances of the one mutually affect those of the others. Operating in their appropriate fields, they were intended reciprocally to aid and support each other. Cicero has beautifully said, "The family is the seminary of the state." It is, to a greater extent, the nursery of the church. When the purity of the family is corrupted, and its sacredness disregarded, both the church and the state suffer in their dearest interests. If the church become corrupt, and lose her power over the minds of men, the state soon feels the effect, in the increase of crime and disorder among its citizens. If the state fail to accomplish its divine mission, and allow crime and disorder to prevail among the people, the church immediately suffers in the decline of piety, and the neglect of duty, of her membership. At times like the present, the people of God, who owe duties both to the church and the state, in yielding to the greater demands of the state, are prone to neglect their duties to the church. At such times, the state demands an undue proportion of our time and labors and substance; which our consciences readily construe into a good excuse for disregarding our obligations to the church. There is no part of duty which Christians are more easily induced to omit, than that which forms the substance of this discourse. No grace is more feebly developed in most Christians; none whose exercise is more easily obstructed than Christian beneficence. It is always, therefore, with great difficulty, that the ordinary benevolent operations of the church can be carried on in a time of trouble like that which now exists in our country. Those who are benevolent from principle are compelled to give more liberally

to make up the deficiency of others. Constant efforts have to be made by pastors and agents, by preaching and by writing, to prevent many members from falling sadly below their duty. No efforts, aimed at counteracting this downward tendency, are more likely to prove efficacious than the plain exposition of the teaching of the word of God on this subject. All true and permanent motives for the discharge of Christian duty, must be drawn from the word of God. It must be very gratifying to all lovers of the Lord's cause, that all our benevolent operations have suffered so little during this civil strife. And yet, it has required very great exertion, on the part of the managers of our various benevolent operations, and their friends, to prevent the appearance of much larger deficits in their balance sheets. Since the field for every benevolent operation is continually enlarging, and since the war itself is every day presenting new objects for Christian labors, and since the ability of many is very much weakened, it is manifest that still greater efforts must be made in the future to sustain all our beneficent labors, even at their present standard. It is exactly in this view, therefore, that we have undertaken to present to the consciences of God's people, a plain and simple statement of the teaching of the Scriptures, on the subject of Christian beneficence. Our only design is to set forth, as clearly as we may, the teaching of God's word on this important part of Christian duty. And because our aim is purely a practical one, we propose to address ourselves directly to the enlightened conscience of our Christian readers; and to exclude from this article everything that does not conduce to such an end. No original discussion of the subject is attempted; only a plain presentation of the well-known scriptural argument is offered. And it is addressed, not to critical eyes, but to the hearts of the Lord's earnest and sincere people, who desire to know their duty, that they may do it. What we have to say on the whole subject is very naturally divided into two parts; the first part explaining the system of beneficence taught in the Scriptures; the second part setting forth the motives to beneficence, which the Bible addresses to Christians.

PART FIRST.

I. "The chief end of man is to glorify God, and to enjoy him forever." The final cause of man's creation was the glory of God. He was so created as to find his highest happiness nowhere but in God. The obligation to glorify God rests on all men alike, whether they have acknowledged or refused to acknowledge the obligation.

But, when a man has been brought to a sincere belief that the Son of God laid down his life for his soul; when he has obtained a strong hope, that he has passed from death unto life; when he feels the peace of God in his soul; when he has proclaimed his sense of duty to glorify his Redeemer by uniting with the visible church; the first question that such a man would ask, is "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Under a deep sense of gratitude, he makes a solemn and final consecration of himself, soul and body, of his time and talents, of his property and influence, to his Divine Redeemer. This consecration is real; and the professor of religion who has not made it, has not really accepted of Christ, nor truly given his heart to him. The want of completeness in their consecration of themselves and all they have to God, is the secret of much of that uneasiness and disquietude, which prevent even many true Christians from enjoying full peace of mind. Their surrender was never unconditional.

Suppose, now, a sincere Christian having, for the first time, made such a consecration of himself to God, and having already offered his children to the Lord in baptism, under the influence of his first love to his Saviour, to open his Bible for the purpose of learning his duty to the world, to the church, and to his God. He must feel that he is bound, by every consideration of duty and gratitude, to use all his substance, to engage in business, and to do all that he does in life, for the single purpose of honoring the Lord that bought him. In this serious perusal of the word of God, one of the points of most diligent inquiry will be what the Bible teaches as to the use to be made of his property. He opens and reads:

1. That God is the original source of all wealth. The Scriptures teach the sublime truth that God made all things out of nothing. Upon this firmest of all foundations, the

divine word rests the whole fabric of God's ownership of the world. "The earth belongs to Jehovah, and the fullness thereof, the world and all they that dwell therein." "Every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills." "The silver is mine, and the gold." The Christian joyfully recognizes his Creator's absolute ownership of all the works of his hands, and exclaims, "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory; for all that is in the heavens and in the earth is thine."

2. He reads further, that the Divine Ruler disposes of all this wealth to men, in his sovereign pleasure, to be employed by them only for his own glory. The true foundation of man's right to the earth, or any of its blessings, is in God's gift of it to man, in Eden. But man has always mistaken the nature of his title to the world. He is only a tenant, holding at the will of the great Proprietor, a dresser of the vineyard, not its owner, a steward managing his Lord's possessions in his absence.

But the Divine Husbandman also distributes his possessions in the exercise of his sovereign pleasure. To one steward He gives one talent, to another two, to a third ten. By the parable of the talents, the Saviour teaches that the Divine Father, in his sovereign wisdom, has given to all his children, according to their several abilities; that each one will be called to account for every talent however small; that even the decisions of the judgment day are made to depend upon our fidelity, or the want of it, in improving the talents committed to us. "And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." The parable of the Unjust Steward teaches, among other things, that he was displaced for squandering his Lord's money on himself.

No true Christian will be disposed to reply to this argument, by saying, "I make my wealth by my labor and economy; or that God has ordained certain fixed laws, obedience to which naturally results in wealth." For, who gives the health and strength to obey these laws? Does not God send his rain upon the just and the unjust? Do you not toil in vain when the earth is parched? Does he not hold the winds in his fists, and sometimes send them abroad to sweep man's proudest

structures from the earth? Does he not hold the waters in the hollow of his hand, and often send the raging flood to destroy the homes and wealth of whole districts? The idea that man can gather wealth, independently of God's favor, is preposterous. If it were true, there would be few poor in the earth.

No candid and intelligent Christian can continue this examination throughout the Scriptures, without coming to the conclusion that all his worldly possessions are the gift of God, intrusted to him for the purpose of promoting his Saviour's glory. He will, therefore, solemnly dedicate all his possessions to God, or, more correctly, he will acknowledge that they already belong to him. And he will be careful to avoid the common mistake of trying to compromise with his Maker, by dedicating a portion to him, and considering the remainder as his own, to be used for his own pleasure.

II. Suppose such an inquiring Christian, with this impression on his mind, that he must use all his possessions for the glory of God, to resume his examination of the Scriptures on this interesting subject, and to turn to the sixteenth chapter of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, and there read: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." Let us briefly record some of the valuable lessons which this instructive passage would teach him.

1. He could not fail to perceive that this passage does not contain mere advice, but an authoritative command: "*As I have given order to the churches of Galatia, so do ye.*" It was given by an inspired apostle in a solemn formal manner.

It rests on the same authority as any other part of the word of God. It commands a particular duty, and urges compliance in a specific manner. This command was not local and temporary in its application. Paul had already given the same order to the churches of Galatia, whose circumstances were quite different. The epistle is addressed "to all that, in every place, call upon the name of Jesus Christ." It is the constant habit of the Divine Spirit to give instructions for the whole church under special cases. Instructions are given, in

this epistle, on a special case of church discipline, respecting a particular question about marriage, and concerning abuses connected with the administration of the Lord's Supper; all of the questions arising out of the peculiar circumstances of the Corinthian church; and yet, no Christian man doubts that the rules and principles laid down in settling these special cases are still binding, touching these matters, on the whole church of God. The moral law itself, the law of the universe, was originally given to a single people for their own government.

This command comes to us, therefore, clothed with the same authority as the law of the Sabbath, or that requiring obedience to parents. A strange laxness prevails in the minds of many Christians about obeying this command. They seem to regard the whole matter of Christian beneficence somewhat in the same light as optional studies in the college curriculum, which may be taken or rejected at the pleasure of the learner. They act as if they thought it was left discretionary with them to obey this divine injunction or to neglect it. On the contrary, we see that Christians can not disobey or neglect the requirements of this passage, without setting at defiance the authority of God. But he that persistently disobeys the known will of God can hardly be called a consistent Christian. This is the first lesson which this passage yields.

2. In the second place, the inquirer would learn from this passage that this command is universal in its extent. "*Let every one of you lay by him in store.*" To every one that calls on Christ, and looks to him for salvation, this command is addressed. No one is excepted—none can be excused. It is not the rich only that are commanded to give of their abundance, but also the poor of their poverty. If benevolence be a duty, all must discharge it; if it be a privilege, all are entitled to its enjoyment. In the same passage, we learn that Paul had already given the same orders to the churches of Galatia, in which we know the poor abounded. He also desires the Corinthian brethren "to know the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia; how that, in a great trial of affliction, their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality." The apostle bestows his highest

commendation upon the poor for their cheerful compliance with his requirements. Seven hundred years before our Saviour appeared, Isaiah told us: "The Spirit of the Lord God was upon him; because the Lord hath anointed him to preach good tidings unto the meek." When the Divine Master publicly entered on his work, he explained this passage to mean "that he was anointed to preach the gospel to the poor." The crowning proof, which He offered to John of his Messiahship, was that "the poor have the gospel preached unto them." He was born of poor parents, spent his life among the poor; most of his mighty works were done among the poor, and for their benefit. Hath not God chosen the poor to enjoy most richly the blessings of the Gospel? Were they then to be excluded from all share in spreading the glad tidings in the world? He that loved the poor so well has not so shaped his system. On the contrary, He has so arranged his plan for promulgating the truth, that the gifts of the poor are essential to its success. Nor have the rich any advantage of the poor in the exercise of this grace: we are miserably mistaken if we suppose that it is the amount of our contributions that commends them to God. The all-sufficient God does not need the meager offerings of his people. "If I were hungry, I would not tell thee." This whole plan of carrying on his cause in the world, by the gifts of his people, was ordained in order to relax the griping power of selfishness in the human soul; to draw from it streams of benevolence and love; to make His people like unto Himself. It is not the greatness of the gift, but its spirit—the willingness and self-denial that are in it—that gives it value in the eyes of our Lord.

Both the Divine Master and Paul have distinctly settled this principle. While urging this very point, of cheerful giving, the apostle says, "for, if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." "The willing mind" is the acceptable quality in the gift. Our kind Master knows, exactly, how much he has bestowed on his stewards, and does not expect more than he has given them. And the blessed Head of the church, on one occasion sitting over against the treasury, saw a "certain poor widow" come and "throw in two mites, which

make a farthing;" and added, in his most solemn manner, "verily, I say unto you, that this poor widow hath cast more in than all they which have cast into the treasury." In behalf of God's poor we bless his name, that he has told us so plainly why he pronounced her gift greater than the larger sums of the rich. "For," says He, "all they did cast in of their abundance, but she of her want, did cast in all that she had, even all her living." Her beneficence met divine approbation, because there was in it more love, more sacrifice. Let, therefore, no member of the church say, "I have nothing to give." The only meaning such language has, in the mouths of many is, that they can not make handsome donations like their wealthy neighbors. They do not mean, that they could not give a mite. If a mite be all that you can afford, give it cheerfully; God only asks what you have, and not what you have not.

Although not contained directly in this command of the apostle, it is no violent inference from it to say, that it is the duty of parents to train up their children in this branch of piety, as well as every other. They should be encouraged to earn something, or to deny themselves some pleasure, that they may give in their own names to all benevolent operations. If neither of these methods is feasible, though much inferior in its effects, parents ought to divide their own gifts, allowing each child to give a part. The importance of early training is not more to be seen in any branch of true piety than in this. It is extremely difficult for a man, who is brought into the church late in life, and only then begins to give, ever to become truly liberal. The command is addressed to all Christians. This is the second lesson.

3. The third important principle settled for the Christian, desiring to know his duty is, that the exercise of this grace, must be stated and frequent. "*Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him.*" In whatever way the collection was to be made, it must be made weekly. Nothing is said definitely, for or against collections in the church, but only that a portion of our income be laid aside for benevolence on the Sabbath day. There is, however, no evidence that Paul meant to exclude collections from the church, but the reverse. If he intended to instruct Christians to lay aside their gifts on

the Sabbath, *at home*, the injunction would seem to defeat itself; for the "gathering" which he desired to avoid would still have to be accomplished after his arrival. On the contrary, one of the strongest reasons for the appointment of the Sabbath day, was because the early Christians assembled on that day for worship. It was, too, in accordance with Jewish custom, to take up collections for the poor on the Sabbath. Many other reasons make it highly suitable for the Sabbath to be appointed for this service. "It secures the constant action of the heart in the work." We must not only worship God, but "do good on the Sabbath day." The Sabbath is a day of thankfulness and joy, and, therefore, we are invited with gratitude to make our offerings unto the Lord. The Sabbath celebrates the most joyful event in the history of the world, the resurrection of the Son of God; how appropriate, then, that deeds of charity should mingle with our songs of praise to our risen Redeemer. But the strongest of all reasons for the appointment of the Sabbath was, what we shall more fully understand hereafter, that the Scriptures regard almsgiving as a religious exercise, and therefore eminently appropriate to the Sabbath day and to the house of God. It should, therefore, be discharged on the sacred day, and in the great congregation, when the affections are most elevated by the worship of God.

From all of these reasons for the appointment of the Sabbath we are clearly taught how frequently it ought to be exercised. The plain teaching of the law is, that collections should be raised every Sabbath, in connection with the public worship of God. We believe that the law is still literally in force, and that it would greatly promote the interests of the church, pecuniarily and spiritually, if it were now strictly obeyed. And by comparing the practice of the church with this requirement, we see how far she has departed from the apostolic standard. The principle is, doubtless, difficult of application, by many persons. Those whose gains are not weekly, who can not so frequently learn the condition of their business, do not find literal obedience to the precept easy. While it suits one Christian better to give weekly, and another monthly, the very least that will fulfil the demands of this law is, that the giver must, at frequent and stated intervals, examine his

income, and assess upon it a proper per centage, and consecrate it to benevolent purposes. "It must be frequent, that it may keep pace with his earnings; it ought to be stated that it may not be forgotten." The essential requirement of the passage is, that beneficence must be systematic. Perhaps the best method, for the greatest number of persons, is the per centage system. Let Christians, in view of all their circumstances, settle on a proper proportion of their income, and then consecrate it to God's service. Let this proportion agreed upon be frequently revised, that it may be kept conformed to their changing circumstances, and that their hearts may be frequently exercised on the matter. This proportion, whether it be a great or a small sum, should then be held as a sacred possession.

4. This divine law, which we are interpreting, would teach the inquiring Christian, what proportion of his property should be devoted to God. The law is very explicit and clear: "*as God hath prospered him.*" Nothing less than the consecration to beneficence of a part of our estates and incomes, proportioned to the prosperity which God has bestowed, will at all satisfy this divine requirement. No matter how much we may give, if it be not in proportion to the prosperity with which God has blessed us, it is still the benevolence of Ananias and Sapphira. No matter how small our gifts, if this principle control them, they are acceptable to the Master.

The idea of proportional beneficence is taught, in many forms, in the Scriptures. "If any man minister, let him do it of the ability which God giveth." "As we have opportunity, let us do good to all men." Where much is given, much will be required. Our Lord is a kind master; he does not require us to serve him beyond our means; but he does insist that our service shall correspond to the ability which he hath bestowed. Let us endeavor to study more fully the application of this rule to the question of our duty.

a. This precept requires that our beneficence be proportioned to the sum total of our property. It has been shown in a former passage, that God is the author of all wealth, and the sovereign bestower of all that man, his steward, possesses. No man can gather any more wealth than God bestows on him; no man of industry and economy has less than this sum. The

aggregate of men's estates, therefore, corresponds exactly to the prosperity which God has bestowed on them. It is apparent, then, that our benevolence must correspond to the sum total of our possessions. The rich are bound to give a much larger sum absolutely than the poor. The man of moderate means can not so well afford to diminish the aggregate of his estate lest his income entirely fail. It may be the duty of many rich men to give to benevolent purposes half of their estates. After a Christian man's estate has reached the point of ample sufficiency, for the support of himself and family, and for providing a moderate portion for his children, it may be his duty to give all of his future increase to God's cause. Of course, we are not teaching that it is always wrong for men to *accumulate* property. It is a duty to be "diligent in business;" the result of which is the increase of property. Large fortunes are very useful in the business of this world; and, if held as consecrated possessions, and for the glory of God, are very important to the success of the church. But is it right for Christians to pursue, through life, an unbroken course of accumulation, withholding from a world famishing for the bread of life, tens of thousands, simply as a security for their own ease, and for the aggrandizement of their children? Would not many Christians give up, at once, to the conversion of the world, thousands, and some even millions, if the love of Christ constrained them, as it did Paul?

But it is a poor means that some Christians have discovered of trying to atone for a life-long inconsistency in this matter, by devising, to benevolent purposes, large sums in their wills. This device, besides, being in many cases an attempt to satisfy conscience for long neglect of duty, is liable to the serious objection, that it dodges the responsibility laid personally on the Christian. You are God's steward for whatever he has given you. You have no right to postpone, till after death, the payment of the fruits of your vineyard. To withhold, from a perishing world, all that the Lord has given us, to use it for our own comfort and glory, as long as we live, and then magnanimously determine to give it to him, when we can no longer retain it, is doubtful beneficence. In benevolent matters, it is best for every one to be the executor of his own will. The moment you place it in God's hands it is safe forever.

b. Our charities must be strictly proportioned to our annual income. Income is not always proportioned to the sum total of property. Many persons have large incomes who have but little estate; many receive fine salaries, who have but little fixed capital. Manifestly, therefore, the larger the income, the higher per centage of it ought to be devoted to benevolence. A poor widow may not be able to give a tenth of her income, without denying her children necessary bread. A day laborer can not as well spare five dollars from his annual gains, as many a rich man can spare five thousand. In early life, when the income is barely sufficient to support one's family, duty to those whom God has made dependent on him, may require the young Christian to content himself with devoting a very small proportion of his income to charitable uses. Most certainly, when his income has been greatly enlarged, and a considerable surplus remains over, after the support of his family, he is not at liberty to keep the proportion fixed at the same rate. A tenth, or even a less sum (owing to the *smallness* of his income) may, at one time, have fully met the requirement of the divine law, while at another time a half may no more than satisfy its demands.

These seem to be the two leading principles that ought regulate the beneficence of those who have property or income; but there are many of God's children who have not much of either. What do the Scriptures teach about the duty of such persons?

c. Christians are required to labor diligently, that they "may have to give to him that needeth." In man's present condition, labor is a blessing to his physical, mental, and moral nature. The law of God's government is: "If any man work not, neither should he eat." No Christian is allowed to be "slothful in business." Both idleness and laziness are sins. Thousands of professors of religion sin daily by doing nothing. A sincere and active Christian regards every power of body and mind, as a talent from his heavenly Father, and is industrious in the employment of them for his glory. If, therefore, any of the people of God, have no other means of exercising the grace of liberality, the divine law requires them to labor with their own powers of body and mind, that they may obtain the necessary means. Many a man, now receiving aid from others, might, by industry,

become himself the joyful dispenser of alms. But the wealthy more need this exhortation, because they do not feel the necessity of personal exertion. Many Christians seem to think they have a perfect right to retire from business, as soon as they have amassed a sufficient fortune to sustain themselves and families, in ease and luxury, for the remainder of their days. But is the treasury of the Lord full enough? Are not myriads of souls perishing in perdition every year, for the want of means to send them the Gospel? If any Christian has enough for himself, why not spend the remainder of his days, in productive labor, for the purpose of doing good? How many additional stars might many a Christian set in his crown of rejoicing.

d. Self-denial must be called to our aid, in providing funds, for the exercise of Christian benevolence. Our glorious Head, "who was God, and thought it no robbery to be equal with God," gave the universe the highest example of self-denial. In the exercise of this virtue, our Divine Master requires all his people to imitate his footsteps. "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." It is, also, essential to discipleship: "And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, can not be my disciple." Unsanctified human nature is extremely selfish, loving its ease, seeking the indulgence of its passions, and the gratification of its appetites. This self-indulgent spirit must be eradicated from the soul. There is no earthly good, that the Christian must not be willing to give up, for the sake of Christ. If any Christian is unable, otherwise, to cast anything into the Lord's treasury, it is a Christian duty to deny himself that he may obtain the means. If Christians can not, in any other manner, obtain the means of being beneficent, they must curtail their expenses, simplify their mode of living, practice economy, dispense with all luxuries and elegancies, before they decrease their contributions to their Saviour's cause. Our very flesh must feel want, before we allow our Saviour's glory to suffer, and souls to perish. It is sinful for Christians to say, "we have nothing to give," when they and their families "are clothed in fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day." This was the quality in the poor widow's mite, which made it so precious in the eyes of the Saviour,

while the large gifts of the rich passed unnoticed. And herein is a solemn warning to the rich, who give only of their superfluity, and never feel what they give. Can this be the Saviour's meaning when He says, "verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven?" These four principles on which we have commented at length, contain the chief points of the system of beneficence prescribed in the Scriptures.

III. Let us briefly notice a few, of the many, advantages of this system.

1. It provides regularly for beneficence as one of our necessary expenditures. How strange that a Christian, who regards himself as a steward of God, should determine all his estimates for the coming year, without making any provision for his Lord's portion. And yet the great majority of Christians do so act. The system here commended would induce a Christian, when he sits down at the beginning of the year, to adjust his expenditures to his probable income, to make beneficence one of the regular items of his expenditures. In truth, the Lord's portion is, first, to be taken from his whole income, and the remainder distributed among his various accounts. If we have an annual income of a thousand dollars, and if one tenth be the moderate proportion which we have devoted to religion; one hundred dollars are first subtracted and placed in a separate column, and considered sacred to religion. This amount, then, is always ready. In the minds of many Christians, a hard battle has to be fought with selfish interests; many others are sincerely perplexed to decide between the claims of their families, and their business, and those of religion, as often as the Lord calls for any part of the revenues of his kingdom. A systematic plan at once removes this difficulty by securing a decisive victory at the beginning of life; and all that is necessary thereafter, is to adjust the proportion of his income to his changing circumstances. This systematic exercise of this grace would also save Christians from many hurtful errors. Under the ordinary system of irregular and fitful giving, because they give quite a sum on some important occasion, they are left under the impression that they have given more than they have. A systematic giver knows exactly how much he has given, and

how much remains to be disposed of in this way. It also takes away from Christians the small excuse which they often make, "I have no money." The only sense in which this is true of many men is, that they have none on that particular occasion. They have had it, they have loaned it for interest, or they have otherwise invested it. Had they been acting on any proper system, they never would have disposed of the Lord's portion.

Such a system would also remove the objection, that collections come too often. A systematic giver has already made his appropriation to each benevolent cause; and it makes but little difference to him whether collections are made at short or long intervals.

2. Some such plan, as we are unfolding, would dispense with all special agencies for the collection of funds, which are always costly, and frequently injurious to the grace of liberality. Of course this system, if adopted by all our churches, would save the entire expense attending the agency system. Where this system has been depended on, its cost has always consumed a considerable part of the entire sum raised for benevolent purposes. But a far graver objection to "agents" than their costliness is, that they largely fail to cultivate the grace of liberality in the heart of God's people. That careful examination of the Scriptures, on which we are insisting, can not be made without producing the conviction that systematic beneficence is a part of true religion, and that every Christian is bound, in conscience, to be a liberal and cheerful giver. Why, then, should the cultivation of this branch of true piety be taken out of the hands of the pastor and session, the divinely-appointed overseers of God's house, and committed to an agent, any more than the prayers and faith of the church? Pastors and sessions not only have far greater advantages for cultivating this grace, but they have no liberty, from their Divine Master, to allow the control of this ordinance to pass out of their hands. Not only is the system itself thus wrong, but agents have not always plied the church with the most proper motives. The Apostle of the Gentiles seems to have intended to correct this capital error, when he directed this particular system to be adopted, in order "that there be no gatherings when I come." Surely he would have obtained a larger collection, if he had waited till he reached

Corinth, and then portrayed, in lively colors, the sufferings of the poor saints at Jerusalem. Paul, full of humility as he was, could not have been ignorant of his own splendid oratorical power, nor of the effect on the imaginative Greeks, of such a tale of suffering and sorrow as he could justly have unfolded. How fine a field for Paul's eloquence! what sufferings! what trials! what heroic endurance for Christ's sake! what tearful sympathy he might have excited! what a magnificent collection he might have secured! And yet Paul deliberately cuts himself off from all this advantage, by insisting, that there be no "gatherings" when he arrived. What could have been his motive? His object was not merely to obtain a large collection, but to form, in the Corinthians, the habit of systematic giving. For this reason, he brought to bear on their hearts no motive inferior to God's supreme authority and the constraining love of Christ. His argument was one purely evangelical, formed of pure gospel elements.

How nearly the usage of the Presbyterian Church, in raising funds, has conformed to this apostolic example, her people well know. What have been the motives generally brought to bear, by special agents, on our churches? Did they often make a thorough discussion of Christian beneficence, in its principles, showing it to be a certain effect of conversion, and a duty which none can fail to discharge and be loyal to Christ? Was it not usually the burden of their efforts to arouse our sympathies for the perishing heathen, or the suffering missionary toiling in our western wilds, or the candidate for the ministry struggling to secure an education, with which to serve his Divine Master? All of which are motives not wrong, but not the highest. Christians were begged to give, as if they had a right to refuse. The result was a "temporary ebullition of sympathy, a fitful, meteoric burst of feeling, followed by a long period of apathy and inaction." Perhaps a larger sum was obtained at that time, depending, however, largely upon the skill and eloquence of the agent, but the heart only closed the tighter for this sudden surprise. But these transient flashes of benevolent impulse are no more like that elevated Christian feeling, produced by deeply pondering the principles of the gospel, than the noisy and uncer-

tain mountain torrent is like the deep, perennial river that ever spreads life and beauty along its shores.

3. The apostle's plan would tend to give our charities more of the character of "free-will offerings." We are clearly taught that our gifts, however large, are not acceptable to the Lord, unless given with a cheerful spirit. In the gospel, the Lord has not given us a written statute, regulating the details of our charities, as he did to his ancient people; but he has left the number and amount of their gifts to be determined by the love of his people. Love always acts freely and cheerfully. Very much, however, of what is given, under the ordinary system, is wrung from its possessors by various motives. From some it is simply begged, by the importunity of the agent or the pastor; others give for the good name it gives them; some to keep even with their neighbors; others grudgingly. Perhaps they had not intended to give much when they went to church, but owing to the pungency of the sermon, the force of the argument, or the tenderness of the appeal, their consciences compelled them to give more, but of course they could not do it cheerfully. Alas! how much, even of the small sums raised in our churches, is given from some imperfect or deficient motive. Such gifts may be used by the Lord for good, because they were already his own; but the rich blessing attached to giving is wholly forfeited by the donor.

All of these serious evils are prevented by the plan prescribed for the Corinthians. One of the strongest reasons for the adoption of this regular system is, "that it is expedient for you who have begun before, not only to do, but also to be forward a year ago," "to make up beforehand your bounty whereof ye had notice before, that the same might be ready, as a matter of bounty, and not of covetousness." He urges them, in strong language, to give cheerfully. "Every man as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give, not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver." To them of Macedonia, he holds up the fact that "Achaia was ready a year ago." Then in turn, holds up to the Corinthians "the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia." See, too, what a glorious illustration his system finds in these same poor Macedonian Christians. It is not Paul, but they

that beg, that he would accept their offering and hasten with it to Jerusalem. "For to their power, I bear record, yea, and beyond their power, they were willing of themselves; praying us with much entreaty that we would receive the gift, and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints." This is the spirit which the adoption of this system produces in the hearts of Christians. When a man's sum is already separated, and consecrated to God, conscience will not let him keep it. If the church neglect the matter, he will seek a channel through which to forward his own gifts. It is more blessed for such a soul to give than to receive.

4. This system would conduce to business habits, and produce incidentally various good results. The frequent examination of one's income for the purpose of regulating the proper proportion of it to be given to benevolence, would produce a happy effect in keeping him acquainted with the exact condition of his business. Many persons labor under serious error as to the amount of their incomes. Many farmers in our country contend, that even in good times, they do not make three per cent. on the capital invested in their farms. Of course, they mean by this statement, that they do not clear this amount, after they and their large families have eaten, and worn, and wasted, as much as their hearts can wish. Let them, however, charge their farms with fair rent, cost of seeds, manures, implements, stock, and labor, then let them credit them with every production, every bushel of grain of every kind, all hay, fodder and oats, every head of stock reared, all milk, butter and cheese, all vegetables and fruits; let all these be computed at the market value, making no allowance for living, and it will be clearly seen, that their farms are far more profitable than was supposed. It is manifest that this is the true method of estimating an income, in order to determine the proper amount to be devoted to benevolence. And yet how many Christian farmers say they have no incomes, because they have consumed large sums in bountiful living.

Another good effect of this system is to promote sobriety and prudence in business. We earnestly believe the habit of many Christian men of trading every year to such an extent, as, in case of failure, to involve their whole estates, thereby

staking the peace and comfort of their families and their ability to give anything to the Lord's service, upon the uncertainties of a single trade, to be reckless and sinful. When a Christian has consecrated all his possessions to his Saviour, he is not willing to engage in such hazardous enterprises.

5. The last advantage of this system, which we mention, is that its general adoption would secure largely increased funds for benevolent uses. It is a lamentable fact, that a large number of our congregations contribute nothing to the boards of our church; some give to one or two, some neglect all of them. In particular churches, many members neglect the duty of beneficence wholly or in part. The practical effect of introducing such a scheme into a presbytery would be by the force of example, and by inquiries which the presbytery should annually make into the working of the scheme, to induce all the churches, under the care of the body, ultimately to practice the system. The effect of adopting such a plan, by a particular church, would be gradually to draw all the members into its operation. Again, a systematic plan will greatly increase the aggregate sum obtained. Many know to their sorrow, the silent, deceptive power of interest to accumulate. On the same principle, a regular per centum of our incomes would produce surprisingly large sums for benevolence. The deep snow is accumulated by the falling of imperceptible flakes; the mighty river first fell on the mountain tops, in the small streams of the rain showers. The Romish Church gathers vast sums by the collection of Peter's pence. These are a few of the many advantages, which this scriptural plan enjoys over every other method of exercising this grace. We have now closed all that we have to say upon the system of beneficence prescribed in the Scriptures, and have come to the second part of this article, in which we propose to discuss the motives which the Scriptures bring to bear on Christians, to induce them to exercise freely and joyfully this Christian grace.

PART SECOND.

In discussing the fourth important precept, derived from the Apostle's command to the Corinthians, namely, the proportion of our property which we ought to devote to benevolent pur-

poses, we found that the terms of the law were indefinite; that though a proportionate principle was taught clearly enough, yet the fixing of the per centage is left to the enlightened understanding and Christian conscience of believers. According to the degree of grace with which Christians are endowed, one would fix the rate much higher than another. One servant may be contented with a tenth, another's heart may prompt him to bestow a fifth, while so consuming may be the love of another that he joyfully pours out the half or even all of his gains. Here, then, is precisely the point for instruction, for argument, for exhortation—the place to set forth, in strong light, the motives to the exercise of this grace, with which the Scriptures ply the Christian's heart. How much shall we give? How high shall we fix the proportion? What instruction has the statute book of the king given to guide us in adjusting, from time to time, the per centage of our changing incomes? On this point, the argument of the Scriptures is exceedingly clear and forcible.

I. That we may be able to appreciate, in its full force, the accumulating power of the scriptural argument, let us recall here, in a word, the point made in the beginning of this article—that God, the Creator, is the source of all wealth; that he bestows riches on men in his sovereign pleasure; that he intrusts his possessions to different stewards, and according to their ability; and that he requires of them faithful management, and punctual payment of interest. Our first argument, then, is that man and all he has belongs to God; that God's right to demand all, or any portion of man's possessions, is absolute, and that man's duty to return whatever his Divine Ruler calls for is simple justice.

II. In the second place, let us turn to the Mosaic and patriarchal systems, and there learn how God himself settled the principle of Christian liberality. In studying this first ritual of God's Church, we soon discover that no doctrine holds a higher position in it than that of Christian beneficence. It impressed God's image and superscription upon every species of property. The firstling of every clean beast was claimed for the service of religion. The first-fruits of every field and vineyard, must be devoted to God. In reaping, the corners of the field were to be left for the poor.

These were the ears of corn which the pious Ruth was gleaning in the fields of her rich kinsman. Every first-born male child, with which the Jewish parent was blessed, must be redeemed with silver. And it was an unalterable statute in Israel, that every Jewish farmer must devote one tenth of all the produce of his flocks and fields and vineyards to the support of the religious teachers of the land. A second tenth was also devoted to religious feasts and to the poor. Two years in succession, the people were required to go up to Jerusalem, and spend this second tenth in feasts and presents; the third year they were to spend it at home in feasts, for the widow, and orphan, and stranger, and poor of every description. Every seventh year was the great Sabbath, during which all the land must lie idle, and be allowed to produce spontaneously for the poor. Once in seven years all debts must be forgiven throughout the nation. Three times every year, every male Israelite was required to make a long and expensive journey to Jerusalem, to wait for many days on the Lord. In addition to all these direct levies upon their property, the Jews were required to support the most costly system of sacrifices, ever borne by any nation. The bloody sacrifices demanded thousands of the chosen beasts of their flocks. The unbloody offerings were scarcely less numerous or costly, and might be indefinitely increased according to the piety and hospitality of the worshiper. After a careful examination of these various sums, it will be seen that, in the aggregate, the Mosaic system required, for benevolent purposes, not less than one-third of all the productions of the Jewish people. This whole economy, given by inspiration, constantly reminded the Jew that he was only the steward of God, who was the true proprietor of all his herds and fields.

Nor was the patriarchal system less remarkable for the religious consecration of property. Abram, returning from the slaughter of the kings, gave tithes of all the spoils to the king of Salem, who was priest of the Most High God. Jacob, fleeing from the face of his angry brother, vows, that if God will keep him, in all the way, "Of all that thou shalt give me—the tenth—I will surely give thee." This practice seems to have trained the Jewish people for the reception of the Mosaic system, and for that remarkable exhibition of liberal-

ity made by them soon after they left Egypt. Considering all their circumstances, no more magnificent display of beneficence has ever been made in the Christian church, than that exhibited by the Jews, in answer to the call of Moses for materials with which to build the tabernacle. Just escaped from degrading slavery in Egypt, with no means of increasing their resources, with a long wandering, and a fierce war before them, they were the last people in whom to find so high a development of this grace. The call was for a very large sum, and yet so freely do they pour forth their treasures, that Moses is compelled to issue an order that no more offerings be accepted. By careful calculation, the sum of their gifts is supposed to have reached the aggregate of many millions of our money.

Passing down to the reign of David, we find another splendid illustration of the practical working of this system. Although David was not permitted to build a house for the Lord, yet with devoted piety he made the most extensive preparations for the work. "Behold, now," says he to his son, "in my trouble I have prepared for the house of the Lord, a hundred thousand talents of gold, and a thousand thousand talents of silver; and brass and iron without weight; for it is in abundance; timber also and stone have I prepared; and thou mayest add thereto." David's princes, and captains, and the chiefs of the fathers also "offered willingly." Out of these vast preparations the temple was reared at a cost, as some good authorities say, of more than three thousand millions of American dollars. In his last prayer the Psalmist tells us the principle on which he and the people acted in making this magnificent offering. "O Lord our God, all this store that we have prepared to build thee a house for thine holy name, cometh of thine hand, and is all thine own; for all things are of thee, and of thine own, have we given thee." What a clear expression of the idea of Christian stewardship! How strongly did those pious Jews feel that the silver and gold are the Lord's.

III. Let us now inquire what motives the gospel dispensation offers to Christians, to induce them to consecrate a large proportion of their substance to the service of the Lord. But let none reject the conclusion that must be drawn from

the old dispensations, hoping to find a lower standard erected in the gospel. In passing from the types and shadows of the old economy, to the full light and glory of the spiritual dispensation, we ought rather to expect to find prescribed for us a more liberal and beneficent system. If these poor and half-civilized Jews, just escaping from the bonds of Egyptian slavery, could support such a system of beneficence, as we have just described; if, in the contracted sphere which the church was then called to fill, without a single missionary operation to conduct, without a single college to build, or theological seminary to found and maintain, this system of beneficence was considered necessary by divine wisdom; what may we not expect under the dispensation of love under which we live, with a field which is the world, and the commission to preach the gospel to every creature, and with all our ministry to educate by the slow and costly process of the college and seminary?

1. The first strong motive, by which the gospel urges the Christian to devote a large amount of his possessions to his Saviour's service, is drawn from Redemption. The people of God have all been redeemed by their Saviour's precious blood. When we were enemies, Christ died for us. When we had become the heirs of eternal death, He purchased our title to life. When we were the bond-slaves of Satan, Christ laid down his life for our redemption.

No more powerful or tender motive can be addressed to the Christian. No man that really believes that he was once an heir of hell, and that the Redeemer laid down his life for his soul; that ever felt the burden of sin, and the sweetness of pardon, can fail to love his Saviour, or resist the constraining power of that love to devote all he has to God. Therefore, by as much as Christians prize their deliverance from the hateful dominion of Satan, as they rejoice over their escape from hell, as they value their adoption into the family of God, by the estimate they put upon the eternal weight of glory which they hope to enjoy hereafter; by all these resistless motives they are bound to dedicate themselves, soul and body, time and talents, wealth and influence, all they have and are, to their Redeemer.

2. The Christian must exercise liberality, because the sup-

port of our Saviour's kingdom, by the payment of tribute to him, is the expression of our allegiance to him. The Scriptures leave no room to doubt that the world, and everything in it, have been given to the Lord Jesus Christ as Mediatorial King. In the Covenant of Redemption, made between the Father and the Son, touching the salvation of sinners, not only were his own people given to him, but all things, the world with all its resources, men and angels. The Saviour plainly affirms "that all things are delivered unto me of my Father." Again, He says, "All power is given unto me, in heaven and earth." The original word for "power" means authority, dominion, rule. It is often used for princes and potentates among the angels, and among men for rulers and magistrates. The meaning, then, of the passage is, that, in the economy of grace, all the material wealth and resources of the universe have been placed at the disposal of God-Man, Mediator, and that He has received, by commission, the right of supreme dominion over all angels, pure and fallen, and over all men, rulers and subjects. The Apostle Paul states positively that "He is the head over all things to the church." He is elsewhere called "the Lord of lords, and the King of kings." According to these Scriptures, the Mediator is the present supreme ruler of the universe, making all men and all things subservient to the advancement of his kingdom. Above all the monarchs and rulers of the earth, independent of their mightiest works and wisest schemes, sits Zion's King, raising up one ruler, and casting down another, founding one empire, and overturning another, claiming supreme allegiance from every intelligent being, and exercising all this dominion for the extension and glory of his church.

Now, it is the plain teaching of the word of God, that every chief magistrate, lawfully in power, has an undisputed right to so much of the revenues of his kingdom, as may be necessary for the support of his government. On this principle, every acre of soil, every flock and herd, all the gold and silver, belong to the Mediatorial King. Whenever, therefore, our Divine King needs any portion of his own revenues, for the purpose of conducting his government, for the support of his officers and laborers, for the extension of his dominion, or the feeding of his poor—his right to receive it is absolute,

and the duty of his people to pay it into his treasury is positive. One of the prime duties of citizenship among men is the payment of the revenues of the kingdom; and no man is called an obedient citizen who refuses this plain obligation. By the willing discharge of this plain duty to Christ, Christians express their willing allegiance to their King. If the Lord Jesus Christ be the Mediatorial King, ruling the universe for the glory of his church; if Christians be the blood-bought and now voluntary members of his kingdom, their first and most bounden duty is to sustain the government of their King, by paying their means into his treasury.

To the members of his church, every one of them bought by his own blood, this argument comes with peculiar force. Our Saviour has purchased, by the sacrifice of himself, our forfeited lives, our time and services, then intrusted us with the revenues of his kingdom, and staked its extension in the world, and the salvation of men, upon the liberality of his people. Not one of our King's chariot wheels can turn, no gospel can be preached at home, no preacher can be educated, no missionary can be sent to plant the cross on heathen shores, without money. Every heart that is loyal to Jesus, will desire, above all things, to see him worshiped by every human being, and will give liberally of his means until every soul acknowledge the sway of his mild scepter.

3. Beneficence is the necessary effect of regeneration, and is, therefore, treated in the Scriptures as a grace of the Divine Spirit, and classed, in value and acceptability to God, with sacrifice and prayer. This grace grows as naturally and certainly out of the renewed heart, as the quality of the fruit is determined by the nature of the tree. Until conversion, selfishness in some form is the ruling principle of man's heart. To aggrandize or gratify themselves, employs the energies of most unrenowned men. Making money; as a means or an end, and the love of it, are among the most common developments of selfishness.

The Christian is a man whose heart has been changed by the power of the Holy Spirit, who has been made "a new creature in Christ," with whom "old things have passed away," with whom "all things have become new." He has new views and feelings, new loves and hates, new principles

and aims, and new labors and ends. Without this radical change, there can be no true religion in the soul. In the soul in which this change has occurred, the dominion of selfishness, as of every sin, is broken, though its deliverance is not always complete. Every such renewed soul the Holy Ghost makes his temple, and adorns it with every heavenly grace. But we are not left in the slightest doubt about this being a grace of the Spirit. Paul distinctly calls it a grace, and classes it with other indisputable graces. In the exposition, which he makes of this important doctrine, in his second letter to the Corinthians, he wishes them to know "the *grace* of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia," which grace, he clearly teaches us in the following verses, was their liberality toward the poor saints at Jerusalem. Again, he exhorts them: "As ye abound in everything, in faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and in all diligence, and in your love to us, see that ye abound in this grace also." Here we have an inspired apostle classing Christian liberality in the same rank with faith, without which it is impossible to please God, and with Christian love, without which, another apostle says, man is a murderer. No language, nor any number of quotations from the Scriptures, can more clearly express the gracious nature of Christian liberality. This, therefore, is one of the graces which the Divine Spirit certainly brings with him when he takes up his abode in the renewed heart. No man can be born of God, and not be benevolent; unbroken selfishness is strong evidence against regeneration. We are not deterred from making this strong statement, by the fact that many professors of religion fail almost entirely to exercise this grace, although they maintain, in many respects, a credible profession of faith. "For this ye know," says Paul, "that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolator, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God." These words exclude a covetous man from the pale of religion, and from the gates of Heaven. "The Holy Ghost never committed such an oversight, as to regenerate a soul, and leave it under the power of covetousness. The product of the new birth is a new man, with all the members of a man developed, not one mutilated and wanting in this or that limb. Every grace of the Spirit has a propor-

tionate, though it may be a feeble, development. And it would be no more absurd to speak of a Christian without faith, than of a Christian without beneficence. A Christian infidel is no more a contradiction in terms than a Christian without charity." This is one of a chain of graces, out of which, if one link be wanting, it will not be strong enough to bind the soul to the throne of God. The growth of the soul in grace is like the growth of the healthy body, all the members grow together. To say, therefore, that a man is a good Christian, but that he will give nothing, and sacrifice nothing, for the support of the gospel, and for the extension of his Saviour's glory in the world, is to use improper language. The certain effect of grace in the soul is to make a man liberal. But this grace, we are taught, is equally as acceptable to God as sacrifice and prayer. Paul, with a heart filled with gratitude, writing to his Philippian brethren, assures them that the little offering, which they had sent him by the hand of Epaphroditus, was "an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice well pleasing to God." The angel of the Lord assures Cornelius that his "prayers and alms had come up for a memorial before God." "Prayers and alms," says Alexander, "are the two kinds of religious service previously mentioned, as the proof of the centurion's devout regard to the Divine will and the true religion." The divine messenger classes his prayers and alms together, as being alike acceptable to God. The delight which God takes in this exercise of true piety can not be expressed in stronger language or more beautiful imagery. In the same manner, as the fragrant vapor ascended from the golden altar of incense, and pacified the angry Jehovah, and as the prayers of the saints, perfumed by the merit of Christ's death, are now treasured in golden vials by our reconciled Father, so is he pleased with the exercise of this grace.

But, of the acceptableness of this grace to our Divine Father, we are left in no doubt. As prayer is the outward expression of humility, of dependence, of faith and love in the soul, so almsgiving is the expression of the graces of gratitude and love, and is accepted as such by the Lord. "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse," says Malachi, "that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the

Lord of hosts, if I will not open to you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it." In the previous verse of this chapter, the people "are cursed with a curse," because they had robbed God in not paying their tithes and offerings; and in this verse the richest blessings are promised in answer to the discharge of this duty. Paul urges his Hebrew brethren "to do good and to communicate, forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." And again, the apostle shows his appreciation of this grace, by appointing that it be exercised on the first day of the week, in connection with other regular parts of divine worship.

4. The peculiar pleasure which the Lord takes in the free and voluntary exercise of this grace, seems to explain the costly nature of the system prescribed by Moses, and the lavish expenditure made on several great occasions by the Jewish people. When Solomon had finished the magnificent temple, for which his father had so long prepared, he dedicated it to God with a sacrifice of "two and twenty thousand oxen, and a hundred and twenty thousand sheep." Many other similar sacrifices are recorded in the Old Testament. From the position which we have found the Scriptures assigning to this grace, we see that, instead of these sacrifices being merely wasteful and extravagant displays, they are joyful expressions of gratitude, which are highly acceptable to Jehovah. How strangely do these magnificent contributions contrast with those of many modern Christians, when they offer, out of boundless wealth, a mere pittance to the Lord that bought them!

5. That we have given the correct interpretation of the word of God touching this important part of Christian duty, we refer to the high authority of our own standards. Although we believe fully in the doctrine of these venerable symbols, that nothing but the word of God can bind the conscience, yet these standards have the highest authority, with so many of God's people as have received them, as containing the correct interpretation of divine truth. The Confession of Faith says, "saints by profession are bound to maintain a holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, and in performing such other spiritual services as tend to their mutual edifica-

tion; as also in relieving each other in outward things, according to their several abilities and necessities." The Form of Government classes along with the ordinances of prayer and praise, expounding and preaching the word, that of "making collections for the poor, and other pious purposes." The Directory for Worship orders, that "the sermon being ended, the minister is to pray, and return thanks to Almighty God; then let a psalm be sung; a collection raised for the poor, or other purposes of the church." These quotations clearly teach us, that our venerable church considers liberality a grace of the Divine Spirit, and its exercise in almsgiving as worthy to have a place in the devotional services of God's people, in the sanctuary, on the Sabbath day.

6. And the last authority which we offer, as to the meaning of the divine word, is that of the General Assembly, the highest court in the church. This venerable body has repeatedly affirmed, not only that liberality is a grace of the Spirit, but has taken still higher ground, and declared that almsgiving, which is the expression of liberality, is itself an act of worship. The Assembly of 1855, which met at Nashville, teaches the doctrine of these pages with great clearness: "It can not be denied that our churches have been too much accustomed to look upon giving as purely a matter of Christian liberty, a thing which might or might not be done, according to the impulses which happen to prevail at the moment, without, in either case, involving the integrity of Christian character; what has been given has been regarded as a bounty, and those who solicit it represented as beggars." "The law in relation to the question before us, is, that liberality is a grace of the Spirit, almsgiving an office of Christian worship, and collections for the poor and the spread of the gospel, an ordinance of God. Giving, in the Scriptures, is put upon substantially the same basis as prayer—the one is the sacrifice of the lips, and the other of the substance." "He is the beggar who solicits the favor of having his gifts accepted, and he feels it to be a distinction, that he can glorify God with the fruits of his substance."

Such is also the purport of the resolutions passed by the Assembly of 1858, of which the following is a copy of the first and third :

"1. Every man is a steward of God, in the management of the time and talents and substance which God has intrusted to him."

"3. Contributions of our worldly substance, for religious purposes, from religious motives, in a scriptural way, is a Christian duty, and is a part of true piety as fully and completely, as praise and prayer, sacraments, or any other religious duty or exercise. It is not one of the offices of religion which a Christian man is at liberty to neglect, or slightly perform at his own pleasure. He who is not regularly a man of prayer can not be accounted a consistent Christian, neither can he who is not regularly a man of beneficence."

The Assembly at Lexington advances a step, and boldly declares almsgiving itself to be an act of worship, and that such was the meaning of the deliverances of former Assemblies. These are its words: "The Assembly would respond to this call, by reiterating to and before all our churches, the testimony of the Assembly of Buffalo, and the Assembly at Nashville, that liberality, in giving for the support and propagation of the gospel, is a grace of the Spirit; that it is a fruit, and an evidence, and a means of grace; also, by reiterating, the testimony of those Assemblies, that offerings of money for the service of the Lord *are acts of worship*, which ought to be systematically and solemnly performed by all our churches and by every Christian."

Although the Scriptures offer many inducements to the exercise of this grace, we ought not to pass from the motives which we have already set before ourselves, without attempting more fully to appreciate their richness and power. The New Testament, with the utmost clearness, requires systematic beneficence, and explains fully the plan prescribed; but in accordance with the greater liberty of the gospel dispensation, it does not, like the old economy, fix in figures the amount of each man's gifts. Its argument, however, is far more cogent, its motives much stronger, its persuasion more affectionate. As we have seen, the nearest approach that it makes to a definite statement is, that every one give "as God hath prospered him." But, when obediently and gratefully the Christian comes to the sacred writings to inquire how high he shall fix the proportion of his income, the argument

becomes irresistible : it is the argument of love. It refers the grateful soul to the Saviour's blood-bought right of redemption ; it compels the soul loyal to Christ to pay his gifts into his Lord's treasury ; it teaches the new-born soul that Christian beneficence grows necessarily out of the nature of true religion in the soul ; that it is an important grace of God's Spirit ; it assures him that his Lord accepts his offerings with the highest satisfaction. The irresistible motive which the gospel presses on every child of God, is the cross of Christ. It is an argument formed out of pure gospel materials. This is exactly Paul's method of presenting this subject to the Corinthians. His reason for writing to them, in advance, and directing that every one on the first day of the week lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, is that "there be no gatherings when I come." How strange this clause sounds to us, who have been accustomed to our modern harrowing appeals and pitiful entreaties ! Why did not Paul wait for the collection till he reached Corinth, and then with that eloquence which so overpowered the heathen on one occasion, that they brought out oxen to sacrifice to him as to a god, lead captive his audience ? Why did he not portray in deepest colors the sufferings of the poor saints at Jerusalem, and excite their pity and stir up their compassion with some heart-rending scene of the Holy Land ? How different was the argument of Paul ! Merely pointing with one hand to their poor brethren, and with the other stretched toward distant and bloody Calvary, he directs them to the example of their bleeding Saviour, as the highest of all possible motives, exclaiming, "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." See, says Paul, the eternal Son, in all the riches of his glory, "which he had with the Father before the world was ;" see him in the manger, in Gethsemane, on Calvary, then remember that it was "for your sakes," he thus humbled himself. Think of yourselves, once "children of wrath" and heirs of hell, now joint-heirs with Christ, "to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away ;" and then with your love thus kindled, determine how much you will give. True, the New Testament does not determine by arithmetic the amount that

the redeemed children of God must contribute; but it tells them to measure their debt of gratitude to their Saviour; it asks, in tenderest love, thrice over, "lovest thou me more than these" worldly possessions? it inquires how much do you dread hell, how much do you prize heaven? When the Divine Master presents himself in the person of the poorest of his children on earth, and you close your heart and purse against him—when you that have "this world's goods, see a brother and sister in need, and then shut up your bowels of compassion"—it asks in mingled pity and sorrow, "how dwelleth the love of God in him!" And this is the whole motive of the gospel; it neither knows nor offers any higher inducement to any good deed, than "the love of Christ constraining us." If any man resist this, the gospel has no motive more powerful.

IV. The Lord has offered a large reward for the exercise of this grace. Good works do not merit any reward from God; for when we have done all our duty, the Saviour has taught us to say, "that we are unprofitable servants." While this is true, the Lord has in mercy offered a reward for lives of faithful service.

The grace we are now considering has clearly the promise of this life and the life to come.

1. It clearly has the Lord's promise of blessing in this life. Of course, it is not meant that beneficence will always ensure wealth. The Lord has set too low an estimate on wealth to offer it to his children as the reward of their obedience. And as many of his people already love it too well, it would be neither fatherly nor kind to bestow on them freely the very thing that would most endanger their salvation. The general tendency of the system, as we have already seen, is to promote industry, energy, and enterprise. It is, none the less, the effect of this system to promote sobriety in business and economy in living; to beget in the young Christian habits of fidelity, watchfulness, system, and exactness, and to restrain from hazardous adventures.

If now we turn to the word of God, we find it full of promises of temporal prosperity to the benevolent. In the argument which Paul makes to his Corinthian brethren on this subject, he says, "he who soweth bountifully shall also

reap bountifully. Every man, according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, nor of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver." "And God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work." Here the promised reward of giving is, that Christians shall have abundance to give more and more. With the greatest tenderness the Lord says, "thou shalt surely give thy poor brother, and thy heart shall not be grieved when thou givest unto him; because, that for this thing, the Lord thy God shall bless thee in all thy works, and in all thou puttest thy hand unto." "Honor the Lord with thy substance, and with all the fruits of thine increase; so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses burst out with new wine." "He that hath pity on the poor, lendeth to the Lord, and that which he hath given him, will he repay him again." If these Scriptures be not devoid of meaning, they do teach us that the Lord does reward the liberality of his people in this life; that he does pay back their charities in kind.

2. Nor are we less clearly taught that the free exercise of this grace is rewarded in heaven. Gold and silver can not purchase heaven, but the Divine Teacher does not leave us to doubt, that his own people, who are saved by his blood, may greatly enhance their final reward by the proper use of their wealth on earth. One of the most marked features of the judgment day is, that the righteous are proved worthy to enter into the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world, by the meat and drink and visits of mercy which they have bestowed on the least of the Lord's brethren on the earth. The Lord Jesus, after expounding the parable of the unjust steward, draws from it this lesson of warning and encouragement: "I say unto you, make unto yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." According to the illustration contained in the parable, the Saviour teaches that when we have passed away from our earthly tabernacles, the poor and unfortunate, whose hearts we have gladdened by our charities while in the stewardship, are represented as standing with open arms to receive us into glory.

If this view of the teaching of the Scriptures be correct, what a blessed opportunity is given to those, to whom the Lord has given many talents of wealth, to add new stores to their crown of rejoicing. Here is the true philosopher's stone, which converts the base metals of earth into the fine gold of heaven. But let not those to whom the Lord has given fewer talents fear, lest the rich may have greatly the advantage over them. For, the rule has already been established, "If there be first a willing mind, it is accepted, according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." Where less is given, less will be required. If faithful over two talents, you shall be made ruler over two cities.

V. The Scriptures exhibit in the strongest terms, the dangers of refusing to exercise this grace of the Spirit. The opposite course of conduct invariably leads to covetousness, which is idolatry. We have not the space left to portray the dreadful effects of covetousness on Christian character; how it gradually converts the Christian into a robber, robbing his Maker, in tithes and offerings, robbing the widow and fatherless, the poor and distressed of the claim which God has given them on the benevolence of his people; how it uniformly leads to falsehood and wrong-doing; how it destroys natural feeling and tenderness of conscience; how it transforms many ministers of the gospel into mere place-hunters; how it is entirely inconsistent with the idea of redemption; how it conflicts with the constraining power of Christ's love over our souls. We have already shown that no covetous man hath any inheritance in the kingdom of God. Covetousness is the love of money; which "is the root of all evil." While God does reward the cheerful giver, he does as certainly punish the miser. "He that soweth sparingly, shall also reap sparingly." As the unjust steward was trusted long, and finally turned out of the stewardship for squandering on himself his Lord's goods; so will our Lord do, if we are unfaithful in his vineyard.

True, the Lord may not always take our possessions from us; for the sake of his covenant with us, or with our fathers, he may allow us to retain them during our lives; but he frequently takes them from our children; for whom we have so fondly

hoarded them. It has become a proverb in this country, that the rich of one generation are the poor of the next. How frequently does it happen, that the possessor of a hoarded estate is scarcely quiet in his grave before his treasures are scattered to the four winds. Or, if the Lord does not take away our possessions from our children, he frequently makes them a curse to those whom we intended to bless with them. The life of ease and luxury, which wealth engenders, unnerves the youth, and unfits him for that manly exertion, which is necessary to any great attainment. There are few more fatal errors than that parents can, by treasures gathered during their lives, secure their children happiness, independent of their own exertions. No character, nor reputation, is of any lasting value, that is not the result of the most thorough personal training and discipline. No man can either secure or long maintain himself in any position, which he did not win by his own exertions. Through labor and suffering, lies the only path to true greatness. In passing along this rugged pathway, much treasure is rather a hindrance, than a help. Let children be thoroughly educated (not filled with books), let them be well trained in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, let them be reared in habits of industry, and a very small portion of wealth will be sufficient for them. Without these virtues, no amount of wealth will long do them any good.

We have now given at least an outline view of some of the principal motives, which the Bible offers to Christians, to induce them to give largely of their substance, and fix high the proportion of their incomes to be devoted to the service of their Lord.

We are now prepared to appreciate, in its proper fullness, the Bible presentation of this whole subject. The Scriptures clearly prescribe a plan of systematic beneficence, full and minute in its details. The law is peremptory, universal in its application, requiring frequent and stated obedience, and fixing the measure of its exercise in proportion to the prosperity which God has bestowed on his people. Then, when the earnest inquirer desires to know definitely the meaning of the words, "as God hath prospered him;" when he asks

how high shall I fix my standard? how much shall I give? the Scriptures teach him that God is the only source of wealth; that he distributes his possessions to men according to his sovereign pleasure; that all property holders are merely the stewards of God; that the whole world, with all its possessions, has been given to the Mediator; that he in turn has bestowed his riches upon the church, his blood-bought bride, to be used by her for the glory of her Lord. Then, to encourage the church to do her whole duty in this behalf, her Divine Lord, pointing her to the system by which he trained his ancient people, with plainness teaches her, that Christian beneficence is of the very nature of true religion; that it always springs up in the heart where his Spirit dwells; then, as a crowning motive, which he knows her heart can not resist, he points to his own cross, and bids her measure her beneficence by her love to him. Our Divine King appeals to each of us, as the creatures of his hand, the pensioners on his bounty, as his stewards, to whom he has intrusted the resources of his kingdom; as blood-bought sinners, by our deliverance from hell, by our title to heaven, by our reward at the great day; in the name of our Creator, in the name of our daily Benefactor, in the name of our Redeemer King; to us, by all these resistless motives, he appeals, that as we abound in every grace, in faith and utterance, in knowledge and all diligence, and in our love to him, so we should abound in this grace also.

If now this be the correct teaching of the Scriptures in this regard, on what a different basis, then, does it place this whole subject of almsgiving from that on which it is commonly supposed to rest. Instead of being lords and masters of our possessions, doling out our pittance to the church according to our pleasure; we find ourselves simply the tenants of our Divine Lord, occupying till he come. It clearly shows us, that the Church of God is not the beggar she is popularly regarded; that the Saviour of the world is no beggar; that the ambassador of Christ, who comes and proclaims these truths from the statute book of the kingdom, and calls for the revenues of his Lord's government, is no beggar.

May we not, now, in conclusion, venture to urge this whole

subject more directly upon the careful and prayerful consideration of our Christian readers. We have purposely confined our attention, chiefly, to the teachings of the Bible, because we are writing for the Christian community. No Christian who has followed us through this article, can fail to see that something like the plan, which we have unfolded, is revealed in the word of God; and that the plan, whatever it be, comes to us with the sanction of divine authority. None may, therefore, refuse the discharge of this plain Christian duty, and be an obedient Christian.

How does it come to pass, then, that a system of Christian duty, so clearly revealed, of such vital importance to the success of Christ's cause, and enforced by the most powerful motives that can reach the human soul, is so generally neglected? To show that it is not generally practiced by Christians, needs but a glance at the annual reports of the boards of our church. Some of them report as many as one-half of the churches under the care of the General Assembly, as contributing nothing to their treasuries. Of course, if so many whole churches entirely neglect to take up collections, we may expect to find thousands of individuals, in churches which do give, wholly neglecting this divine command. And, of those churches and individuals, reported as contributing to the board, many of both have no systematic plan whatever. They give only when aroused to a spasmodic effort, by the visit of the agent of some board, or by a special effort of their pastor.

We earnestly entreat every Christian reader to adopt some scriptural plan of systematic beneficence, and continue to practice it through life. If the Lord has given you more than it is proper, in the light of this subject, for you to retain for yourself and family, then prayerfully consider how much of it this divine law may require you to devote to strengthening the endowment of some needy college, or feeble theological school, or to founding a library, or other charitable institution, that may continue to pour forth streams of blessing long after you have gone to your reward.

If, however, you determine that it is your duty to retain all, then, as all Christians of smaller means ought to do, settle

with yourself, as nearly as you can, your yearly, monthly, or weekly income as suits you best, think of Christ's love for your soul, and in view of all your circumstances, fix the proportion of it which you will give to your Saviour as high as your gratitude to him will allow; and never touch it for any other purpose. It is a sacrifice to God. Take from this sum so much as is necessary for the support of the gospel at home; then divide the remainder among the boards of your own church, and such other benevolent objects as you may think deserve your benefactions, according to your judgment of their relative importance, reserving a small balance for occasional calls. Whenever, therefore, a call is made, for a given cause, you know exactly how much you have to give to it. If your church neglect to make the collection when the proper time arrives, make your own donation and forward it to the proper destination, as you would offer your own prayers. How vast a change, in all our benevolent operations, would the adoption, by every Christian, of this simple system produce! No more pastor's salaries unpaid, how many weary laborers' hearts would be gladdened! How much swifter round every wheel of our King's chariot would fly! How much sooner the millennium would dawn!

We can not close, without assigning, with diffidence, however, one manifest cause of the general neglect of this important subject. This system of beneficence will never be carried extensively into operation, without the earnest effort and watchful care of ministers and church sessions. The teaching of Scripture, on this great theme, is but very imperfectly understood by many members of our church. It is the bounden duty of ministers to preach the whole will of God to men; nor can there be the least breach of modesty, in expounding the divine teaching on this subject. We do not ask ministers to beg (would they had never done so!), but only to make the people of God know and feel what he requires of them; and we vouch for the Lord's true people, that they will not long neglect their duty, after it is clearly understood.

But mere preaching is not sufficient. It requires the earnest, personal, persevering efforts of pastor and session, to

introduce such a system into a congregation. On the other hand, as soon as such efforts are made, they will, in great measure, be crowned with success. When a church is reported as contributing nothing to purposes of general benevolence, we generally expect to hear that, at least, only insufficient effort has been made by the pastor to instruct the people in their duty. When a minister has long had the religious instruction of a church in his hands, and, in the end, is starved away from it, we generally think that it is his own fault. No grace of the Divine Spirit is more cultivatable than Christian beneficence.

DANVILLE REVIEW.

No. VIII.

DECEMBER, 1863.

ART. I.—*Shams and Presumptions of Physical Philosophy.*

WE hold in great respect and honor, all men of true science and true philosophy of whatever kind. Their value is inestimable, and their honor should be sacred in the eyes of all good men. Every encouragement should be given to them, and every obstacle possible, should be removed from their path. They should be made to feel that the world looks upon their laborious and persevering investigations with applause, because of the expectations of good. And they should feel that it is Christendom, and not heathendom or infidelity, that is their only true and reliable friend.

But while we say this, and say farther, that all true science and philosophy, like all true religion, are changeless and eternal, yet there are more shams and more empty pretensions put forth in these latter days, under the names of science and philosophy, than of any thing else. Knowing the weight which these deservedly have among men, the shallowest pretenders are everywhere flaunting their banners under the authority of these honorable names.

But men cheat themselves and others in the use which they make of these terms. It is apt to be presumed that men, claiming science as peculiarly their own, are all that they claim to be. That they have great breadth of learning, great variety of information, and great capacity for just and general reasonings. They are supposed to be clear and wide in their range of thought, exact in their perceptions of truth, and greatly enlightened and candid as to all inferences and deductions to be drawn from their own especial pursuits. But no

mistake is greater than this. Science, in its large and enlightened sense, is both modest and positive. Positive in all things clearly proved, and dubious and modest in all things yet unsettled. And as we are here writing especially for the benefit of our educated and educating young men, we have to say to them, that more numerous, or more splendid cheats are nowhere perpetrated, than under the supposed infallibilities of science.

We have not one word to say against men of very narrow learning, information and philosophy, who nevertheless are attempting to pick their way through the intricacies of some untried scientific path. As first visitors to the secrets of nature, and as discoverers on her domain, they may act their part well and profitably, but we know of no arrogance which is greater, and of no assumptions more contemptible, than when such men undertake, in the pride and feebleness of infidel science and philosophy, to overturn the foundations of Christianity. The very novelty of their knowledge, and the very limited amount of its objects, seem to qualify them for deciding great moral and historical matters entirely beyond the range of their knowledge or competence, and of which conduct, proper qualifications would make them utterly ashamed. How many have been the times, and how great has been the joy, and how long and loud the shout of triumph, when Christianity has been doomed to fall and perish beneath the consuming light of some new scientific discoveries? The troublesome existence of the Bible, and of all the annoying obligations which it imposes on man, was to pass away before the lavas of *Ætna*, the vastness of astronomy, the revealings of geology, the mysteries of mesmerism, the power of phrenology, the various types and origins of mankind, the revived and exterminating forces of pantheism, and so on to the end, if end there be to such premature and idle triumphs. Alas! for the fame of such achievements. The voice of the triumphal shout has scarcely passed away, and the victors scarcely sunk into peaceful repose, before it is found that the battle is not gained, but lost, and that another, and another Marengo game has been played against them. Time and truth have laughed their triumphs to scorn, and no weapon formed against them has beaten their ranks to powder with so much ease and power, as true

sicence and philosophy; and it is a bitter pill to be destroyed by one's own batteries. Allied with Christianity, they have entered the camp of the enemy and chased him from all the fancied bastions of strength, and left him to the mortification of the most ignominious defeat. Christianity has never gained prouder triumphs on any field than just here. And were it not for that supreme ignorance of the past, and that weak, but supreme confidence in the aspect of the present, infidel science would play off with the utmost shyness, against the risk of any more contests on this ground.

We are therefore not troubled in the least, when we hear of some great scientific discovery which is destined to destroy the foundations of our Christian faith. We can afford to be calm as a summer's morning. It is but the old tune played by new hands, and can deceive none but those who think the music new.

Three things may be said in regard to this whole matter. First, the truly great scientific men of the world, such as Bacon, Newton and Boyle, have seen and adored the Creator of those universal harmonies which exist between nature and revelation. They saw no opposition, but on the contrary, they saw what all intelligent minds see and feel, that they most beautifully illustrate and support each other. They are but necessary parts of one great whole; and they, who can see at all, can see that Christianity is the demand and supply of our moral nature, and furnishes besides, the widest, deepest, highest, and most various range of thought to the human soul. It discovers a vastness in variety and in magnitude in the universe, which is not an atheistic blank; it reveals mysteries which are not myths, and it breaks in upon the monotony of the soul with ten thousand additional beauties, sublimities, and glories. True philosophers know that Christianity is the great helper of all true science, and that both are equally of God, and can not be opposed to each other.

A second class of men, are those who may be called scientifically great, but who are without any proper knowledge of the Bible. Such a man was the Astronomer Halley. When he spoke disparagingly of the Bible in the presence of Newton, he rebuked him by telling him that he was willing to listen to him when he spoke of astronomy, because he had studied that

subject, but that he knew nothing of Christianity, and was not therefore qualified to give any opinion about it. Such men are one-sided and lop-sided, and just as their ignorance of Christianity is great, so are they dogmatic and bitter against it. But shall we waste our time upon such men, or shall our young men be bamboozled into unbelief by the ignorant pratings or writings of men who, though great in astronomy, or geology, or politics, or in any one science, are yet without a single qualification to render them teachers, and much less dictators, on the great subject of Christianity. A man may be a great statesman, great orator, or great any thing, and yet be the fool that hath said in his heart, there is no God. Such men may be good authority in their own science and on their own theatre of action, but no where else. Men do not gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles. We do not go to the statesman to learn astronomy, and we do not go to the astronomer to learn statesmanship; and why go to an unbeliever to learn what Christianity is or is not? Let our young men be guarded against a delusion so weak and so ignorant.

A third class of men are your two-penny scientifics and philosophers; soon ripe, soon rotten. Such men are made in six weeks, more or less; for in this great duration of time, they have cracked stone, picked pebbles, hunted up shells and fossils, arranged genus and species, decided the number of the great centres of population, the truth of equivocal generation, fumbled their hands over men's heads, proved Moses to be a humbug and all believers to be fools, with many other wonderful things.

These are the fast philosophers of the world. The ages have not beheld their equals. They decide on all subjects with telegraphic ease and celerity. In mental philosophy they far surpass Locke and Reed, Stuart and Brown and Hamilton. In physical or material philosophy, they have no patience with the slow march and cautious conclusions of past times. For Newton, Locke, Boyle and Milton, and men of their faith, they have an especial contempt. But for Gall, Spurzheim and Mesmer, and for all our modern Spinosas, and for all who have sense and genius enough to reject the Bible, they have the highest and most prodigious admiration.

Is it therefore any wonder that the world looks after such

prodigies of science, learning and philosophy, with reverence and amazement? In their rapid and splendid march to eminence, which others reach only by slow and toilsome degrees, is it any wonder that they should tread down Christianity, and leave it far in the rear of their gigantic progress? Great men do great things: and men of such amazing research, such depths in all philosophies, and such masters in logic, may well be expected to do things still greater and greater. They soon exhaust any one department of knowledge, and need not delay long upon the rationale of their conclusions.

But without irony, let us look at some of the philosophies which we are called upon to receive as sense and truth. Let our young men look at what they are called to receive as the high and pure logic of science. One of the distinguished naturalists of the times, Dr. Oken, says: "Phisio-philosophy has to show how the material took its origin, and therefore how something took its existence from nothing." He then goes on to state, that by "self-evolution," the planets, the flora, the fauna, and all the innumerable tribes and things of the organic and inorganic universe, have had their origin. This phisio-philosophy, is an affair of singular potentiality. Here it goes by the name of "Development theory." It does away with a personal God; but another God is set up under the terms natural law, natural forces, and self-evolution.

But let us look a little closely at these laws, forces, and self-evolutions, whose business it is to bring something from nothing. According to the radical and inexorable necessities of all enlightened thought, whenever any thing is spoken of as "evolved," the idea is unavoidable that it had an existence *before* its evolution, which utterly destroys the self-evolution theory. How can there be self-evolution when there is no self? How can there be evolution where there is nothing to evolve, or to be evolved? How can there be any thing developed from nothing to something, when the fundamental laws of thought and reason wholly reject it as a possibility. Human language absolutely refuses to express this atheistic idea. Evolution, or self-evolution is but the name of the action, in coming from nothing to something, and therefore does not convey any idea of origin. Language rebels, and exposes the extreme folly and weakness of all such theories

and theorists. Human language is constructed upon the deep and true philosophy which every where acknowledges a Great First Cause of all things, and it is a singularly beautiful instance of the depth and power of this abiding philosophy of human language, that it will not consent to express the blank atheism of any such theory, without such a recalcitration as scatters it to the four winds.

Nor is the logic or hope of success any better, when men talk of natural laws or natural forces, generating something from nothing. Natural laws are but the adjuncts of matter. They can not go before it, and can not exist without it. Attraction can have no existence without something to attract and be attracted. Matter and natural laws come into being at the same instant, and are equally the offspring of the same Almighty power.

But such are the wild babblings and blunderings, and such are the wild believings of lies, when a false and bewildered science attempts to remove the Creator from his own creation. Reason in such hands becomes blind and debilitated, and glories in its own shame. It stumbles along in darkness, and rejoices amid theories and beliefs, which it would dignify and honor to call frivolous and puerile inanities.

We do not wish, however, to say that the development theory, in all hands, is equally chargeable with atheism as in those of Dr. Oken. Others supply a creation, existing in nebuleæ, in fire, mist, or in whatever their fanciful philosophy may dictate. After this, the Creator retires afar off, and these philosophers enter, and go to work with their natural laws. With these, they rather slowly, but quite certainly, construct the astronomic universe. But their hardest and most perplexing task, seems to be the bringing forth life in all its forms out of dead matter. As those men, who saw all this, as it rose up gradually before them, and who have recorded it for the benefit of mankind, relate it, it seems that these laws went at their work in a somewhat awkward and unscientific way. They did not seem to know exactly what to do, or to have any definite designs on hand. After, however, considerable darkness and perplexity on the subject, electricity and albumen undertook the matter and found a point, a molecule, or monad, and in this was life. But whether it was any one kind of life,

in distinction from any other kind of life, does not seem to be known; but from these monads or points, all living things have sprung. That bit of life which was in that bit of matter, was in the course of ages developed into an ass, a horse, an elephant or a man. What was the original type of life in that monad from which man originally came, or how many and how various were the types through which he came, before he reached the estate of man, remains among the unrecorded things of this philosophy. That he has most honorably descended from a tadpole, in the earlier stages of his advance, and that in the latter stages thereof, he can trace a distinguished line of ancestral honors through the whole tribes of the monkey, is a distinction which nothing but excessive humility can prevent him from most highly appreciating. There is, however, a great gap between the monad and the tadpole, and between the tadpole and the monkey. Here, as in many other scientific things, we are left entirely to conjecture. Whether after the tadpole, came the toad and the terrapin, the snake and the snapping-turtle, and so on upwards, might be an offence to the science of development to decide. And although we would not upon any account be unscientific and unphilosophical in such a presence as in that of Dr. Oken, yet we are obliged to appear to be against his theory.

And, *First*, theories of science to be respectable must be respectable in their fundamental principles. They must not cross the track nor overthrow the eternal and changeless logic of the human mind.

Secondly, All science based upon what is merely hypothetical, and often extremely hypothetical too, ought to put on no dogmatic manners, and no airs of superiority and haughty contempt in view of truths long known, fairly tried, and dearly loved by large portions of the ablest and most honest of mankind. Especially has it proved dangerous to all men who have run their science and philosophy against the Bible. No science or philosophy ever formed against it has prospered or ever can. The Bible does not stop to even notice or count their existence, while they are soon shattered to pieces and remain as the broken and distorted shadows of the past.

Thirdly, If the first chapter of Genesis is untrue, and if all life, animal and vegetable, was slowly and laboriously devel-

oped along the ages and ages of time, why do we not see the same process of things in operation now? If the Development Theory be true, or any other theory which attributes life in its origin to the mere workings of natural laws, then we have the right to demand the same manifestations of the power of those laws now, as at any former time; and the failure to show this is the failure of all such hypotheses. If there be any thing certain in science, it is the uniform and changeless operations of the laws of nature. At the moment of creation they began their work, and from that instant to this they manifest no weariness, no change and no failure, precisely the same things which they did at the beginning they have been doing ever since and are doing now. It is the climax of silliness and the merest and weakest of all assumptions, to publish in the name of science such manifestations and such acts of the laws of nature as were never known, heard, or read of in the actual developments of time. The laws of nature are the great publishers of their own acts. And if they infused life into points of matter at first, why not now? Why is every type of life complete in itself, and why does not history record the natural development from the monad up through all the various types to that which is ultimate? Why do we not see that mixed condition of things around us which such theories would produce? And why, all over the world now and at all times, do we not see that fashion of life about which these theories are so instructive? Why does man come, and come only, from parents like himself? and why is this so with all animals.

We have been accustomed to look upon science as something sensible, cautious, and reliable, but we are compelled to say that her territory has not escaped invasion by the shallowest of all balderdash and the merest of all twaddle. The sad and exceeding folly of material science is its proneness to theory. If a man is a skeptic he must have a theory to agree with his skepticism, and if he be an ambitious man he loves the honor of overthrowing the Bible and of enlightening the world as no man ever did before. With prompt precipitation he assumes his new and distinguished position. He is a new and great discoverer, and his theory must be new and great to suit the magnitude of his expectations. But while this poor

man is enjoying his incongruous dreams, the stream of time sweeps on and carries his theory, or theories, into the gulf of oblivion, and men only mention his name in pity or in scorn. Can anything be more absurd than to call upon mankind to believe in great and innumerable historical facts which contradict our reason, and in testimony of which there is neither written history, nor observation, nor memory, nor science, nor philosophy, nor anything in all time and in all the world. We consider no forgery greater, and no shame more thorough, and no lying more injurious, than when done under the cover of infidel theories and perverted science.

But how beautiful and how sublime is the philosophy of Moses compared with this shallow atheistic phrenzy. There we see all nature coming forth in its completeness. Here is the Creator and the Creation, and the one worthy of the other. Here science and philosophy have a clear rational start. There is nothing bungling, nothing distorted, nothing ludicrous and unworthy of God. Without this starting point, all men who have touched upon the theories of creation have blundered and fallen like feebleness amid the dark and rough ways of night.

Another specimen of such philosophy is found in Le Comte. What he calls his positive philosophy began to be delivered in Paris in 1829 and was published in 1842 and 1843. Dr. Buchanan says of it, that it is "elaborated with singular ability." If this gentleman had satisfied himself in discussing the matters of natural philosophy with inductive rigidity, he would not have exposed himself to the charge of sentiments so absurd and so deleterious. But leaving his own appropriate field, he must have a theory on man, and here clouds and darkness settle down upon him. It would seem as if judicial blindness was the reward of such folly. Yet in the midst of a confusion, various and boundless, his confidence rises to the highest point of elevation. He has discovered a law which is to immortalize himself and flood the world with light.

Speaking of the human race, he says, "that law consists in this — that each one of our leading conceptions passes through three theoretic states: the state theological, or fictitious; the state metaphysical or abstract; and the state scientific or positive. In other words the human mind — mind of

the race — employs successively three methods of philosophizing whose character is essentially different and even radically opposed: first the theological method, then the metaphysical, and last of all the positive. Hence three systems of philosophy which mutually *exclude each other*. The first of these, the theological, is a necessary starting point of the human mind, the second, or metaphysical is merely provisional, while the third is the fixed ultimate state.” And the supreme glory of the whole is, that it is to be pure, blank, eternal atheism. This is the millennium of the world, according to Le Comte. Of these three states, theological, metaphysical, and natural-philosophical, the world absolutely knows nothing at all, and in the audacity of mere assertion, it has no parallel except among authors of similar sentiment. These states are said to *mutually exclude each other*. They can not overlap or mingle together. The transition of the one to the other must be instant, and they must lie together like two straight edges. But what record, what memory, what knowledge embraces the evidences of any such states or any such changes? None, absolutely none; and what man, capable of knowing himself and of reading the nature of man in all history, does not see that this whole thing or theory is among the most bungling of shams, pretences, and assumptions?

The history of that exclusively theologic race, where is it? Where are its metes and its bounds? Where did it begin and where did it end? And so of the metaphysical race and state. What are its works and what its history — when and where did it begin, and when and where did it end? and outside of a few men, how much more extensive and powerful is the natural philosophy state and race now, than formerly? Taking the world in the mass, where is the evidence that it is less theological, or less metaphysical now than at any former period? Natural philosophy, or the positive is taking hold of men's minds a little more extensively at present than in times past, but if this is true, it is far more extensively true, that both the theological and metaphysical are doing the same. And if Dr. Oken and M. Le Comte will have us adopt their assertions, they must give us some little proof at least. We would like to have glimpses into the past beyond the generous assumptions of those gentlemen. We would

like, historically at least, to stand among the theologic race, and also to take a view of the metaphysic. We would like to see how the infant theologic race sprang up from the mucus of the sea, or from the microscopic atoms of the land, how electricity touched them off into life, which by many slow and ugly changes ultimated in sheep and horses, hogs and men.

But how does the face of the world, and the history of the race set this triplicate philosophy at naught? What but the befuddled brain of some philosopher could have dreamed this idle dream or could have thought of making it the foundation of everlasting fame? If this adventurous Frenchman, instead of expecting us to admit his boundless and silly assumptions, had attempted to give us the evidence upon which he based his theory, all honest minds would accept his lead to truth if any such thing could be found in any such region. But when such men expect us to receive things as history, which are point blank against all history, and to receive things in the name of philosophy, which true philosophy would not touch with the hem of her garment, and to embrace sentiments which are at endless war with the changeless nature of human reason, and above all, to call upon us to live joyfully in the certain expectation that the final and highest state of man is to be pure atheism, is a thing so monstrous in shape, so preposterous in logic, and so utterly gloomy and appalling in hope and morals, that our astonishment and contempt are pushed to the farthest verge of possibility by the demand. To blot out an all glorious and eternal God, whose Being sheds changeless and unutterable light upon all things dear and valuable to man, to sink him beneath the range of immortality, and to persuade him that in spite of all his capacities and attainments, and in spite of all his lookings into and his aspirations after another life, he must after all, die as the brute dies—and more than all, and worse than all, to attempt to infuse into us the faith that this is all and largely to our benefit, and that the doer of it deserves imperishable honor, is such an instance of insane devilishness as has indeed occurred in former times, but never under such lofty scientific and philosophical pretensions.

How this French philosopher could stand on the Gallic side of the channel and write such insane follies, without a sense

of rebuke from the mighty names of the dead and the living, on the other side, can only be accounted for upon the ground of moral torpor — the stupefaction of conscience and the flight of truth.

When we find such stuff as this floating among the philosophies of the day, and when we find every shape and fashion of error, physical, metaphysical and moral, putting itself under the advocacy and protection of science, it is almost sufficient, for the moment, to fill us with contempt for learning as a conspiracy against truth, and as a fraud upon mankind. Yet we well know how powerful an ally all true and unperverted learning is to all truth, but especially divine truth. True and large learning has nothing to do with these shallow theories and philosophies falsely so called.

The great central error of this spurious mode of philosophizing lies in what is called natural law. Natural law makes something out of nothing, and is therefore the Creator. It makes men and animals out of sea mucus, atoms, and albumen. It is a fine Delphic oracle. It has all the mystery necessary to furnish most ample scope and play for the wildest and most romantic imagination. It is endowed with an existence antecedent to all other existences, and with a power, a wisdom, and foresight equal to the production of all created things. This natural law is an independent self existence. Common minds and true reason would pronounce this impossible and absurd, but not so with these philosophers. Abstraction is all concrete with them. They can have law without a lawgiver. They can have law at work, without a law executioner. They can have white, without anything to be white. They can have attraction, gravitation, repulsion, and all manner of material affinities, before there is anything to be attracted, gravitated, repulsed, or held together by affinities of any kind. They can have the apple before the tree, the light before the sun, the child before the parent, and every other absurd thing which atheistic thinking may dictate. But such are the sheer inanities which are uttered in the name of science, and claim the attention of mankind upon the ground of their philosophical depth and truth. The radical and essential idea of all law, moral, political, or natural, is that of a preceding law giver. It is natural law, springing out of the

power of the supremelawgiver, which gives order, permanence, and security, to the works of nature, just as moral law gives order, beauty, and permanence to the conduct of men. Law, in the sense of natural philosophy, is but the manner in which nature operates. To talk about natural law as antecedent to and separate from matter, is like talking of disposition as antecedent to and separate from mind. Natural law and creation are contemporaneous. And there is nothing which casts a sneer so utterly annihilating upon these blundering follies of atheism as the true voice of natural philosophy. What but a bedlam philosophy ever dreamed of natural law existing before nature; of the laws of light before light, and the laws of life before life! Common sense, common observation, and the common philosophy of the human mind, rise up in contemptuous scorn of all such puerile and befuddled methods of thinking.

But we are ourselves glad, that the philosophy of all such errors should be as weak and preposterous as their tendencies are base and deleterious; and as man is no more a moral being, according to the teaching of these atheisms, but a mixture of the tadpole and terrapin, the gallinipper and hornet, the buzzard and the monkey, with how many other ingredients of animal life, hot or cold, fiery or sluggish, no one can tell: so mankind will no longer be at the cost or trouble of providing for the moral aspects and demands of our nature. The press, with all its appurtenances of Bibles and long list of moral appliances, may be pitched into the sea. Churches will vanish as the relics of barbarous times. The stone mason and the brick; the carpenter and the painter; the joiner and the glazier, will be discarded. Booksellers, and binders, and paper makers, and all the tribes and trades of men, whose means of living grows out of the Christian faith, will be dismissed; and as under the reign of atheism, there will be no faith or opinions of any kind worth fighting for; men may "hang their helmets in the hall and study war no more." The great flock-masters and iron-masters, who supply clothing and cold steel for armies, will have to find other outlets for their genius and their trades. Universities and colleges, and all the train of educational cost and appliances, will vanish away as the trumpery of the past, or the shadows of a dream. For who

will incur the cost or endure the labor of imparting learning, or who will undergo the drudgery of its reception, with the idea of a life within him, which lives to day, but dies to-morrow, and dies forever. We can conceive of nothing more besotting than atheism, and if the mind of man could be universally imbued with it, the world would become more thoroughly brutalized than time and sin have ever yet made it.

Let atheism enter the world by whatever avenue, and let it predominate over the minds of mankind, and the science of Bacon, and Newton, and Boyle; the poetry of Homer, and Virgil, and Milton; the prose of Addison, Johnson, and Steele; the oratory of Burke, and Fox, and Pitt, with all the mighty works of all the mighty men of ancient and modern renown, would go down in the universal wreck of oblivion. Atheism, of itself, has no motives to lift it above the sensualist and the beast.

But still, let us look at the ardent promises of the "fixed and ultimate state of atheism," which is the boast of M. Le-Comte. According to this gentleman, the light will then be so light, and the glory so glorious, that human eyes could not yet bear the effulgence of the one, nor human shoulders yet bear the weight of the other. The pods and husks of old learning will then be cast aside, with becoming scorn for all the past, and with highest admiration for all the present. Men and women will then be seen every where starting down to the sea-shore to study sea-slime and mucus, monads and microscopic points, and to demonstrate the great deeds of natural law, about which great men had written great things. To find out this great law, and to discover its actual whereabouts; to be able to point to it in its actual work, in its carefully secreted and curious laboratory, and to silence all doubt as to its actual existence and operations, will be the great achievement of that age of the positive philosophy, when the theological and metaphysical shall be no more. A captious philosophy might inquire where and how this great secret has been so long and so absolutely concealed from the world? when and where did it begin its first manipulations? Is the life which this law imparts in the sea which makes the mucus, or is it in the mucus itself after the sea has made it? Does it

begin in the monad, or in the nothing, out of which the monad is made?

But when these curious inquiries and learned investigations of things have found out the point into which life has been actually infused, how will they discover what life it is? Is it a life which is to ultimate in a gnat or an ox, a monkey or a horse, a man or an elephant, an alligator or a sea serpent? According to this very learned and sagacious philosophy, life appears to be among the most insignificant and undistinguishable of things in its origin. But as neither memory, nor tradition, nor history, nor science, nor philosophy, outside of theories, either virtually or actually atheistic, makes the slightest allusion to such an origin of things, we may be pardoned if we still doubt, until we reach the "fixed and ultimate state of atheism."

But possibly M. LeComte has not set his forces at work with sufficient industry and celerity. But this may soon be done by some adventurous disciple of the positive philosophy. To see all living things moving rapidly on their way up from mud, mucus, and mutton, through all their variations and delays, to the highest range of existence, will be a sight worth seeing and altogether worthy of the scientific afflatus of M. LeComte.

In that period, no doubt the origin of nations will be determined; the numbers of Adams and centres of populations, and the materials from which they have all sprung. The Irish possibly, from fine mist, piperin, and alcohol; the English from salamanders, metal-ores, and sea water; the Germans from sea-marsh, sour krout, and phosphorus; the French from sulphur, mercury, and saltpetre, and the Americans from a liberal dash of the whole in one. But as "universal atheism" has not yet authoritatively decided this matter, it would not be suitably modest in us to do so.

But in all seriousness, we would say to our thinking young men, that just here, and amid the apparent showings of science, lies the very densest regions of shams, and these shams are all the more dangerous from their scientific pretensions. But all truth is one and harmonious. The Bible and science can not contradict each other, and all supposed facts and discoveries in science, which are either atheistic or anti-biblical, or both,

are destined to an ignominious overthrow. No man of sense or knowledge can have any thing for science but the highest respect and honor, but it has had, especially of late years, the great misfortune of very many and very great shams among its interpreters. It is not here or ever, that we bring any charge against science itself. That is always and abidingly faithful in its testimony to the unity of truth ; and none but the shallowest and most timid of men can fear any evil results to the Bible from any real testimonies of science. Science is one thing, and its interpreters are another. And while we often laugh at the manifest incompetence of some of the latter, and while their precipitate conclusions and theorizings are worthy of nothing but ridicule, we give our changeless respect and confidence to science itself. Let men, who have the qualifications of discoverers and classifiers, go forward in their appropriate work, and the intelligence of the world will follow them with encouraging fame and just applause. But let it be well considered, that while Tycho Brahe was the great astronomic discoverer of his times, and while he mapped the heavens better than any other hand had done or could do, yet it required the great analytic mind of Kepler to read those discoveries and to assign them to their appropriate laws. And when the discoverers in modern science have done their great and honorable work, we may then have other Keplers to read and assign these discoveries to their proper laws and duties in the cosmic system.

But after wandering over the wild wastes and utter desolations of atheism, what a refreshing escape to enter once more into the rich floral and productive regions of divine revelation? The eye brightens and dilates amidst the vast variety and grandeur of the scene. The heart throbs with new vigor, and new joy, and faith disperses the clouds and malaria of infidel exhalations. The serene heavens shine with the splendor and majesty of God. "In the light shall we see light." God is the central point of all true science and philosophy, as well as of a written revelation. And where is there a sight more pitiable than your men of science and philosophy, smothered in fog, tangled in thickets of error, and bewildered amid toils and pitfalls on every hand?

Since writing the above, Sir Charles Lyell has published a book to let the world know that man was created ages—God

alone knows how many—before our Bible chronology had a beginning. Well, this is but another added to the number of such assertions so often made, and just as often refuted by science itself. Science is not all infidel, and it has neither been slow nor hesitating in exposing the ludicrous haste of these oft-repeated and unscientific blunders. Sir Charles will wake up some of these mornings to find his misty conclusions all gone, and the Bible standing where it ever has stood and ever will stand. Yet his successors, of similar faith, will repeat similar blunders with the same assurance. They will make the same kind of discoveries, be crowned with the same immortality, and die in the light of the same refutations. They do not seem to know the history of their own mistakes, and therefore do not fear the contempt of these oft-occurring exposures. Always dealing in things seen and tangible, they have little taste or time for things of morals or history.

ART. II.—*The Union and The Constitution.* No. II.

FAILURE OF THE CONFEDERATION.

THE utter inadequacy of the plan developed in the Articles of Confederation soon became apparent. So long as the war continued, the fervor of patriotism, and the necessity arising from a common danger, with difficulty sustained the Confederate administration, and kept the machinery of the government in motion. But a few years of peace demonstrated the necessity of a fundamental change of the whole scheme, not only for the welfare of the Union, but for its very existence. The requisitions of Congress upon the State governments, for the funds requisite to pay the interest of the public debt, to satisfy the just claims of the war-worn troops to whom their liberties were due, and for the other expenses of the Federal government, were met by some of the states tardily, and by others partially or not at all. The non-payment of the public debts, sometimes imposed a necessity, and more frequently suggested an excuse for failure to fulfill private contracts. That mutual confidence which is essential to business prosperity was destroyed. With the destruction of confidence, trade and commerce languished, gold and silver disappeared, and real property experienced an enormous depreciation.

The distress and disaffection resulting from these causes broke out into open rebellion in Massachusetts, and the revolt threatened to be contagious. National bankruptcy, with universal anarchy and ruin impending, for a time obscured the bright hopes of the future which had nerved the arm of patriotism in the darkest periods of the revolutionary struggle; whilst to all these domestic troubles were added the violation, by individual States, of the solemn treaty stipulations of Congress with other governments,—violations which at once assailed the honor and the union of the States and the peaceful relations of the nation with foreign powers.

“The Federal authority had ceased to be respected abroad, and dispositions were shown there, particularly in Great Britain, to take advantage of its inbecility, and to speculate on its approaching downfall. At home it had lost all confidence and credit; the unstable and unjust career of the States had also forfeited the respect and confidence essential to order and good government, involving a general decay of confidence and credit between man and man. It was found, moreover, that those least partial to popular government, or most distrustful of its efficacy, were yielding to anticipations that, from an increase of the confusion, a government might result more congenial with their taste or their opinions; whilst those most devoted to the principles and forms of republics were alarmed for the cause of liberty itself, at stake in the American experiment, and anxious for a system that would avoid the inefficiency of a mere confederacy, without passing into the opposite extreme of a consolidated government. It was known that there were individuals who had betrayed a bias towards monarchy, and there had always been some not unfavorable to a partition of the Union into several confederacies, either from a better chance of figuring on a sectional theater; or, that the sections would require stronger governments; or, by their hostile conflicts, lead to a monarchical consolidation. The idea of dismemberment had recently made its appearance in the newspapers.”*

For evils fatal as these, the Articles of Confederation provided no remedy. “The Confederation appears to me,” writes Washington, “to be little more than a shadow, without the

* Madison. Introduction to Debates, in Elliott, Vol. v, p. 120.

substance; and Congress, a nugatory body; their ordinances being little attended to. To me, it is a solecism in politics, indeed it is one of the most unaccountable things in nature, that we should confederate as a nation, and yet be afraid to give the rulers of that nation,—(who are creatures of our own making, appointed for a limited and short duration, and who are amenable for every action and may be recalled at any moment,* and are subject to all the evils which they may be instrumental in producing,) — sufficient powers to order and direct the affairs of the same. By such a policy as this, the wheels of government are clogged, and our brightest prospects, and that high expectation which was entertained of us by the wondering world, are turned into astonishment; and from the high ground on which we stood, we are descending into the vale of confusion and darkness.” †

In another letter, he says: “I have ever been a friend to adequate powers in Congress, without which it is evident to me we never shall establish a national character, or be considered as on a respectable footing by the powers of Europe. We are either a united people under one head, and for federal purposes, or we are thirteen independent sovereignties, eternally counteracting each other. If the former, whatever such a majority of the States as the Constitution points out, conceives to be for the benefit of the whole, should in my humble opinion be submitted to, by the minority. . . . I can foresee no evil greater than disunion; than those unreasonable jealousies (I say, unreasonable, because I would have a proper jealousy always awake, and *the United States on the watch to prevent individual states from infracting the constitution with impunity,*) which are continually poisoning our minds and filling them with imaginary evils, for the prevention of real ones.” ‡

On the 21st of January, 1786, a resolution was adopted in the Virginia Legislature, upon motion of Mr. Madison, appointing commissioners to meet and confer with like delegates from the other States, with respect to giving Congress more adequate powers for the regulation of trade and commerce. The pro-

* Such was the case with the delegates to Congress under the Confederation.

† Sparks' Washington. Vol. IX, p. 139.

‡ Sparks. Vol. IX, p. 121.

posed convention was held at Annapolis on the 11th of September, when delegates from only five States appeared.

"But," says Madison, "in the interval between the proposal of the convention, and the time of its meeting, such had been the advance of public opinion in the desired direction, stimulated as it had been by the effect of the contemplated object of the meeting, in turning the general attention to the critical state of things, and in calling forth the sentiments and exertions of the most enlightened and intelligent patriots, that the convention, thin as it was, did not scruple to decline the limited task assigned it, and to recommend to the States a convention with powers adequate to the occasion. Nor had it been unnoticed that the commission of the New Jersey deputation had extended its object to a general provision for the exigencies of the Union. A recommendation for this enlarged purpose, was accordingly reported by a committee to whom the subject had been referred. It was drafted by Col. Hamilton, and finally agreed to."†

In consequence of this action, a convention was called by Congress to be composed of delegates to be chosen by the States, "for the sole and express purpose of revising the articles of confederation, and reporting to Congress, and the several Legislatures, such alterations and provisions therein as shall, when agreed to by Congress, and confirmed by the States, render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of government, and the preservation of the Union."* The result was the assembling of that body, by which, with Washington at its head, the Constitution of the United States was drafted.

Of this Convention, James Madison was a member. Attached, in all his predilections to the popular or State rights party, and identified with it in all his eminent career,—he was led by a patriotic devotion to the welfare of his country, and conviction of the extremity of the emergency then impending, to give a hearty coöperation and support to the whole series of measures which resulted in the establishment of the Constitution and organization to the present system of government for the United States.

* Elliott's Madison Papers, 1845, p. 114.

† Journals of Congress, Feb. 21, 1787.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

Than Mr. Madison, no member of the convention exerted a greater influence over its proceedings,—no other assumed a higher responsibility in urging the adoption of the Constitution on the American people. The convention having been called, upon the motion of Virginia,—the delegation from that State had requested Edmund Randolph, one of its number, to sketch a plan to serve as a basis for the discussions of the convention. For his assistance in this work, Madison communicated his views in a letter, written shortly before the sitting of the convention.

“I hold it,” he therein states, “for a fundamental point, that an individual independence of the States is utterly irreconcilable with the idea of an aggregate sovereignty. I think, at the same time, that a consolidation of the States into one simple republic is not less unattainable than it would be inexpedient. Let it be tried, then, whether any middle ground can be taken, which will at once support a due supremacy of the national authority, and leave in force the local authorities, so far as they can be subordinately useful. . . . Let it [the national government,] have a negative in all cases whatsoever, on the legislative acts of the States, as the king of Great Britain heretofore had. This I conceive to be essential, and the least possible abridgment of the State sovereignties. Without such a defensive power, every positive power that can be given on paper will be unavailing. . . . Let the national supremacy be extended, also, to the judiciary department. If the judges in the last resort, depend on the States, and are bound on their oaths to them, and not to the Union, the intention of the law and the interests of the nation may be defeated, by the obsequiousness of the tribunals to the policy or prejudices of the States. . . . An article ought to be inserted, expressly guaranteeing the tranquility of the States against internal, as well as external dangers. . . . To give the new system its proper energy, it will be desirable to have it ratified by the authority of the people, and not merely by that of the Legislatures.”*

The convention met on the 14th of May, but owing to the

* Elliott's Madison Papers, 1845, p. 107.

small number of delegates in attendance, it was not organized until the 25th, when Washington was chosen president. On the 28th, the organization was completed by the adoption of rules.

Immediately upon this, Randolph submitted a plan of a constitution, framed in accordance with the suggestions of Madison. This, together with a paper from Mr. Charles Pinkney, of South Carolina, prepared on precisely similar principles, was at once referred to the committee of the whole.

In committee, Randolph introduced, as preliminary to the detailed propositions, the following resolutions here italicised as in Madison's report.

"1. That a union of the States merely federal, will not accomplish the objects proposed by the Articles of Confederation,—namely, common defense, security of liberty and general welfare.

"2. That no treaty or treaties, among the whole or part of the States, as individual sovereignties, would be sufficient.

"3. That a *national* government ought to be established, consisting of a *supreme* legislative, executive and judiciary."

Here, the word "federal" is used in contrast with national, and as equivalent to the sense in which "confederate," was afterward employed. Before the adjournment of the convention, by a process difficult now to trace, the word was appropriated, by the national party, to designate their system, as contrasted with confederation, under the title, "Federalist." Hamilton, Madison and Jay, published their essays, recommending the Constitution to popular acceptance. Thence, it became the designation of the party whose predilections for a strong national government was satisfied in the Constitution. Thus it happened that the word, originally expressive of confederation principles, became intensely obnoxious to the State rights party. Possibly it was the subject of the "verbal criticisms" noted below.

Of the discussions upon Randolph's propositions, Madison states that, "some verbal criticisms were raised against the first proposition, and it was agreed, on motion of Mr. Butler, seconded by Mr. Randolph, to pass on to the third; which underwent a discussion; less, however, on its general merits, than on the force and extent of the particular terms, *national and supreme*."

"Mr. Charles Pinkney wished to know of Mr. Randolph, whether he meant to abolish the State governments altogether. Mr. R. replied that he meant, by these general propositions, merely to introduce the particular ones which explained the outlines of the system he had in view.

"Mr. Gouverneur Morris explained the difference between a *federal* and a *national supreme* government; the former being a mere compact, resting on the good faith of the parties,—the latter having a complete and compulsive operation. He contended that in all communities there must be one supreme power, and only one."

"Mr. Mason, of Virginia, observed not only that the present confederation was deficient in not providing for coercion and punishment against delinquent States, but argued that punishment could not, in the nature of things, be executed on States collectively; and, therefore, that such a government was necessary as could directly operate on individuals, and would punish those only whose guilt required it." *

After such expositions of the intent of the proposition, it was adopted, and constituted the first resolution passed by the convention. Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina and South Carolina, voted in the affirmative; Connecticut in the negative; and New York, divided. The delegates from New Hampshire did not appear in the Convention till some time after; and Rhode Island was not represented at all.

DIFFERENT PROJECTS.

On the 13th of June, the result of the deliberations in committee of the whole was reported to the Convention in a series of resolutions, corresponding essentially with the plan of Randolph, and designated in the discussions as Randolph's, or the Virginia plan.

The next day Mr. Patterson, of New Jersey, proposed as a substitute what is commonly called the New Jersey plan, which had been prepared in concert by the State rights party, mainly of the delegations from Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Mr. Martin, of Maryland. The following were the leading points of contrast between the two systems:—

1. The Virginia plan proposed the abandonment of the

* Elliott's Madison, pp. 132, 133.

idea of confederation, and the establishment of a system based upon national union. The New Jersey plan, holding on to the notion of State sovereignty and confederation, proposed merely to amend the Articles in some necessary points.

2. The former contemplated a national legislature composed of two houses, the first to be chosen by the people, and the second by the State legislatures, in each of which the representation should be in proportion to population, and the powers of which were to be such as are now exercised by the general government. The other had in view merely to enlarge on some points the powers of "the United States in Congress assembled," sitting as one house, and voting by States.

3. The one proposed to create an individual executive, to be elected by the national legislature, and continue in office for seven years, removable only by impeachment; with powers similar to those now vested in the president, including the veto. The other proposed a plural executive, to be chosen by "the United States in Congress," to hold office for — years, but removable by Congress, on application of a majority of the State executives, and ineligible for a second term; with power to execute the federal laws, to appoint federal officers not otherwise provided for, and to direct military operations; but not to command in person, nor to have a negative on legislative acts.

4. The judiciary, in the one plan, had original jurisdiction in all cases respecting the collecting of the national revenue, impeachments of national officers, and questions involving the national peace and harmony. In the other, its power was only appellate, except in the case of impeachments.

5. In the national plan, the legislature was authorized to negative all laws passed by the several States, contravening, in its opinion, the articles of union, or any treaties of the Union. In the other, the Federal executive was authorized to "call forth the power of the Confederate States, to enforce observance of the laws and treaties of the confederacy."

6. The former system placed the control in the majority of the people; the latter, in the majority of the States, although that should be a minority of the people.

7. Of the one *the people* were the fundamental element, and hence by them it must be adopted. In the other, *the States* were

fundamental, and the ratification was to be by their Legislatures.

The two plans were referred to the committee of the whole. In the discussion which ensued, Mr. Randolph accurately pointed out the fundamental issue between the plans as turning on the question whether, in the ordinary administration of the general government, it should be dependent upon the State authorities for the accomplishment of the general plans, with no other recourse than to the sword as the means of compelling them to faithfulness; or, whether it should have within itself the means of carrying out its own measures independent of the States. "The true question is, whether we shall adhere to the federal plan, or introduce the national plan. The insufficiency of the former has been fully displayed by the trial already made. There are but two modes by which the end of a general government can be attained;—the first, by coercion, as proposed by Mr. Patterson's plan. Coercion he pronounced to be impracticable, expensive, cruel to individuals. It tended also to habituate the instruments of it to shed blood, and riot in the spoils of their fellow citizens, and consequently train them up for the service of ambition. We must resort, therefore, to *a national legislature over individuals*; for which Congress* are unfit. To vest such power in them would be blending the legislative with the executive, contrary to the received maxim on this subject. If the union of these powers, heretofore, in Congress has been safe, it has been owing to the general impotency of that body. Congress are, moreover, not elected by the people, but by the Legislatures, who retain even a power of recall. They have, therefore, no will of their own; they are a mere diplomatic body, and are always obsequious to the views of the States, who are always encroaching on the authority of the United States. . . . A national government alone, properly constituted, will answer the purpose, and he begged it to be considered that the present is the last moment for establishing one. After this select experiment, the people will yield to despair."†

* That is, the Confederate Congress, then existing.

† Elliott's Madison, p. 198.

In the discussions which were had upon these plans the confederate scheme was objected to, as providing no way by which the general government could give effect to its laws, except by compelling the State governments to execute them. Whilst the State rights party vindicated the feasibility and adequacy of this resource, the advocates of a strong national government urged, against coercion, many arguments and expostulations which are now frequently misquoted, as though they condemned the vindication of the national life and sovereignty with the sword. The only coercion which they opposed was the compelling of the State governments to execute the laws of the United States.

Hamilton objected to both the proposed plans, as inadequate to the government of a territory so vast. From a general discussion on the subject of government, and the condition of the Union, he concluded, by way of inference,—“That we ought to go as far, in order to attain stability and permanency, as republican principles will admit. Let one branch of the legislature hold their places for life, or at least, during good behavior. Let the executive also be for life. . . . But is this a republican government? it will be asked. Yes, if all the magistrates are appointed and vacancies are filled by the people, or a process of election originating with the people. He was sensible that an executive constituted as he proposed, would have in fact but little of the power and independence that might be necessary. On the other plan, of appointing him for seven years, he thought the executive ought to have but little power. He would be ambitious, with the means of making creatures; and as the object of his ambition would be to prolong his power, it is probable that in case of war, he would avail himself of the emergency, to evade or refuse a degradation from his place. An executive for life has not this motive for forgetting his fidelity, and will, therefore, be a safer depository of power.

“It will be objected, probably, that such an executive will be an elective monarch, and will give birth to the tumults which characterize that form of government. He would reply, that *monarch* is an indefinite term. It marks not either the degree or duration of power. If this executive magistrate would be a monarch for life, the other proposed by the report

from the committee of the whole, would be a monarch for seven years."

Mr. Hamilton read a sketch of his plan, which was not offered to the Convention, but "was meant only to give a more correct view of his ideas, and to suggest the amendments which he should probably propose to the plan of Mr. Randolph in the proper stages of the discussion."

The only peculiarity in his sketch, beside the points respecting the tenure of office by the president and senate, was contained in the tenth article:—"All laws of the particular States contrary to the Constitution and laws of the United States to be utterly void; and the better to prevent such laws being passed, the governor or president of each State shall be appointed by the general government, and shall have a negative upon the laws about to be passed in the state of which he is the governor or president."*

After some days' discussion on the question,—“whether the committee should rise, and Mr. Randolph's propositions be reported without alteration,—which was in fact a question whether Mr. Randolph's should be adhered to as preferable to those of Mr. Patterson,”—the vote was taken and resulted,—“Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia—Aye,—7. New York, New Jersey, Delaware—No,—3. Maryland, divided.”†

THE NATIONAL LEGISLATURE.

The fundamental point in all the discussions of the Convention, had respect to the constitution and powers of the general legislature. While the State rights party insisted that it should consist of one house, in which the vote should be by States,—the advocates of a national system urged that it be divided into two houses, in which the representation should be in proportion to the population, and the vote *per capita*. In support of this view, it was argued that “despotism comes on mankind in different shapes;—sometimes in an executive, sometimes in a military one. Is there no danger of a legislative despotism? Theory and practice both proclaim it. If

* Ibid, p. 205.

† Elliott's Madison, p. 212.

the legislative authority be not restrained, there can be neither liberty nor stability; and it can only be restrained by dividing it, within itself, into distinct and independent branches. In a single house, there is no check but the inadequate one of the virtue and good sense of those who compose it." *

Randolph stated that the general object of his plan was to provide a cure for the evils under which the United States labored; that, in tracing these evils to their origin, every man had found it in the turbulence and follies of democracy; that some check therefore was to be sought for against this tendency of our governments; and that a good senate seemed most likely to answer the purpose." † Ultimately the plan of two houses was generally acquiesced in.

In discussing the details of their Constitution, a number of propositions were made with a design to give the State governments some control over the election of the first or representative house. These all were rejected, and its election by the people was voted by nine States to one, and one divided. It was then moved that their salaries be paid by the States. This was refused, on the ground, stated by Randolph, that by this means "a dependence would be created that would vitiate the whole system." ‡

Until the closing acts of the Convention, the provision respecting the House of Representatives, was so framed as to require that the number of representatives should not exceed one for every forty thousand. On a motion, towards the close of the sessions, to substitute "thirty thousand," "Col. Hamilton expressed himself with great earnestness and anxiety in favor of the motion. He avowed himself a friend to a vigorous government; but would declare at the same time, he held it essential that the popular branch of it should be on a broad foundation. He was seriously of opinion that the House of Representatives was on so narrow a scale as to be really dangerous, and to warrant a jealousy in the people for their liberties. He remarked that the connection between the the President and the Senate would tend to perpetuate him,

* Wilson, in Elliott's Madison, p. 196.

† Ibid, p. 138.

‡ Ibid, p. 226.

by corrupt influence. It was the more necessary, on this account, that a numerous representation in the other branch of the Legislature should be established." *

The amendment was rejected, but being renewed, after the final engrossment of the Constitution, and urged by Washington himself,—the only occasion on which he interposed in the deliberations,—it was adopted without opposition. †

As to the constitution of the Senate, the proposal was readily agreed to, that its members be elected by the State legislatures; and farther determined, after much difficulty, in complacence to the smaller States,—that the number of Senators from each State be equal. The rule that each member should have one vote, was opposed, "as departing from the idea of the *States* being represented in the second branch." But the objection was overruled by a vote of nine States to one.‡ With a similar view to State control, it was moved that their compensation be provided by the States who send them. But Mr. Madison "considered this a departure from a fundamental principle, and subverting the end intended by allowing the Senate a duration of six years. They would, if this motion should be agreed to, hold their places during pleasure; during the pleasure of the State legislatures. One great end of the institution was, that, being a firm, wise, and impartial body, it might not only give stability to the general government, in its operations on individuals, but hold an even balance among different States. The motion would make the Senate like [the continental] Congress, the mere agents and advocates of State interests and views; instead of being the impartial umpires and guardians of justice and the general good."§

"Mr. Dayton considered the payment of the Senate by the States, as fatal to their independence."¶ The proposal was rejected.

Again the parties joined issue upon the length of the Senatorial term. In the Virginia plan, seven years was the period designated. Three years were proposed instead. "Seven years would raise an alarm. Great mischiefs have arisen in England, from their septennial act." "Mr. Randolph was for

* Elliott's Madison, p. 530.

† Ibid, p. 555.

‡ Ibid, p. 357.

§ Ibid, p. 246.

¶ Ibid.

the term of seven years. The democratic licentiousness of the State legislatures proved the necessity of a firm Senate. The object of this second branch is to control the democratic branch of the national legislature. If it be not a firm body, the other branch being more numerous, and coming immediately from the people, will overwhelm it."

"Mr. Madison considered seven years as a term by no means too long. What we wished was, to give to the government that stability which was every where called for, and which the enemies of the republican form alleged to be inconsistent with its nature. He was not afraid of giving too much stability by the term of seven years. His fear was, that the popular branch would still be too great an overmatch for it."*

In committee, upon the question for seven years, there were eight States in the affirmative, one negative and two divided. When, at a subsequent period, the point came up in the Convention, "Mr. Read moved that the term be nine years. This would admit of a very convenient rotation, one-third going out triennially. He would still prefer, 'during good behavior,' but being little supported in that idea, he was willing to take the longest term that could be obtained.

"Mr. Broom seconded the motion.

"Mr. Madison. In order to judge of the form to be given to this institution, it will be proper to take a view of the ends to be served by it. These were,—*first*, to protect the people against their rulers; *secondly*, to protect the people against the transient passions into which they themselves might be led. A people deliberating in a temperate moment, and with the experience of other nations before them, on the plan of government most likely to secure their happiness, would first be aware that those charged with the public happiness might betray their trust. An obvious precaution against this danger would be, to divide the trust between different bodies of men, who might watch and check each other. In this, they would be governed by the same prudence which has prevailed in organizing the subordinate departments of government, where all business liable to abuses, is made to pass through separate hands, the one being a check upon the other. It would next

* Ibid, p 186.

occur to such a people, that they themselves were liable to temporary errors, through want of information as to their true interest; and that men chosen for a short term, and employed but a short portion of that in public affairs, might err from the same cause. This reflection would naturally suggest, that the government be so constituted as that one of its branches might have an opportunity of acquiring a competent knowledge of the public interests. Another reflection, equally becoming a people on such an occasion, would be, that they themselves, as well as a numerous body of representatives, were liable to err, also, from fickleness and passion. A necessary fence against this danger would be, to select a portion of enlightened citizens, whose limited number, and firmness, might seasonably interpose against impetuous counsels. It ought, finally, to occur to such a people, deliberating on a government for themselves, that, as different interests necessarily result from the liberty meant to be secured, the major part might, under sudden impulses, be tempted to commit injustice on the minority. . . . No agrarian attempts have yet been made in this country; but symptoms of a leveling spirit, as we have understood, have sufficiently appeared in a certain quarter to give notice of the future danger. How is this danger to be guarded against on republican principles; how is the danger, in all cases of interested coalitions to oppress the minority to be guarded against? Among other means, by the establishment of a body in the government, sufficiently respectable for its wisdom and virtue to aid, on such emergencies, the preponderance of justice, by throwing its weight into that scale. Such being the objects of the second branch in the proposed government, he thought a considerable duration ought to be given it. He did not conceive that the term of nine years, could threaten any real danger; but, in pursuing his particular ideas on the subject, he should require that the long term allowed to the second branch should not commence till such a period of life, as would render a perpetual disqualification to be re-elected, little inconvenient, either in a public or private view.* "Various have been the propositions, but my opinion is, the longer they continue in office, the better."†

* Ibid, p. 242, 243.

† Yeates' Report, in Elliott's Debates, 1836, i, p. 450.

Hamilton, G. Morris, and a few others, favored the incumbency of Senators during good behavior; but the proposition was not pressed to a vote. Ultimately, six years was adopted, as convenient for triennial rotation.

THE EXECUTIVE.

With respect to the executive, Randolph separated from the majority of the convention. "He strenuously opposed a unity in the executive magistracy. He regarded it as the fœtus of a monarchy. . . . He could not see why the great requisites for the executive department,—vigor, dispatch and responsibility,—could not be found in three men, as well as in one man." "He was for three members of the executive, to be drawn from different portions of the country."* "On the question for a single executive, it was agreed to. Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia (Mr. Randolph and Mr. Blair, no; Dr. McClung, Mr. Madison and General Washington, aye; Colonel Mason being no, but not in the house; Mr. Wythe aye, but gone home); North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, aye, 7; New York, Delaware, Maryland, no, 3."†

The Virginia plan, as amended in committee of the whole and reported to the Convention, proposed that the President should be chosen by the national legislature, to serve seven years, and be ineligible for a second term. The latter provision having been stricken out by the Convention, Dr. McClung of Virginia moved "to strike out 'seven years' and insert, 'during good behavior.' By striking out the words declaring him not reëligible, he was put into a situation that would keep him dependent forever on the legislature."

Mr. Madison conceived it absolutely necessary to a well constituted republic, that the executive and legislative powers should be kept distinct and independent of each other. Whether the plan proposed by the motion was a proper one, was another question; as it depended on the practicability of instituting a tribunal for impeachments as certain and as adequate in the one case as in the other [in the case of the executive as in that of the

* Elliott's Madison, p. 141, 149.

† Ibid, p. 151.

judiciary]. On the other hand respect for the mover entitled his proposition to a fair hearing and discussion, until a less objectionable expedient should be applied for guarding against a dangerous union of the legislative and executive departments."

Colonel Mason objected to the proposal,—“it was a softer name only for an executive for life; and that the next would be an easy step to hereditary monarchy.”

Madison replied that he “was not apprehensive of being thought to favor any step toward a monarchy. The real object with him was to prevent its introduction. Experience had proved a tendency in our government to throw all power into the legislative vortex. The executives of the States are in general little more than ciphers, the legislatures omnipotent. If no effectual check be devised, for restraining the instability and encroachments of the latter, a revolution of some kind or other would be inevitable.

“G. Morris was as little a friend to monarchy as any gentleman. He concurred in the opinion that the way to keep out monarchical government, was to establish such a republican government as would make the people happy, and prevent a desire of change.”

“Dr. McClung was not so much afraid of the shadow of monarchy as to be unwilling to approach it; nor so wedded to republican government as not to be sensible of the tyrannies that had been or may be exercised under that form. It was an essential object with him, to make the executive independent of the legislature; and the only mode left for effecting it, after the vote destroying his ineligibility a second time, was to appoint him during good behavior.

“On the question for inserting ‘during good behavior,’ in place of ‘seven years,’ (with reëligibility) it passed in the negative. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, aye, 4; Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, no, 6.”*

Ultimately, the presidential term was reduced to four years: not as though that were a proper limit to the executive incumbency, but with the idea of giving the people an opportunity every four years to sit in judgment upon the chief magistrate,

* Ibid, pp. 325-327.

with the expectation that if he had deserved well of his country, he would be reëlected. The doctrine of rotation in office had no favor in the convention.

STATE SUBORDINATION.

The only other subject of discussion in the Convention, which it is necessary here to notice, had respect to the supremacy of the general government, and the means of holding the States in subordination. Of the propriety and necessity of this there was a general agreement.

With respect to sovereignty,—that ambiguous term which has caused so much mischief,—Madison asserted that “the States never possessed the essential rights of sovereignty. These were always vested in Congress. Their voting as States in Congress is no evidence of sovereignty. The State of Maryland voted by counties. Did this make the counties sovereign? The States at present are only great corporations, having the power of making by-laws; and these are effectual only if they are not contradictory to the general confederation. The States ought to be placed under the control of the general government: at least, as much so as they formerly were under the King and the British Parliament.”*

In order to accomplish this, it was proposed by Madison, and incorporated in Randolph’s plan, that the general government have a negative on all laws passed by the States, contravening the Constitution, and treaties of the United States. This plan was speedily seen to be impracticable, owing to the enormous amount of labor which would thereby be imposed on the national legislature. Hamilton proposed to accomplish the object by having the State Governors appointed by the general government, and invested with a negative upon the enactments of the State legislatures. The means at length adopted was that of giving the national judiciary original jurisdiction in all cases arising under the laws, Constitution, and treaties of the United States; and providing that these should be the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

As to the means of enforcing the authority of the general government, Dr. McClung asked “whether it would not be ne-

* Yeates’ Report, in Elliott, i.

cessary, before a committee for detailing the Constitution should be appointed, to determine on the means by which the executive is to carry the laws into effect, and to resist combinations against them? Is he to have a military force for the purpose; or, to have the command of the militia, the only existing force that can be applied to that use?"

It was replied that "the committee are to provide for the end. Their discretionary power, to provide for the means, is involved, according to an established axiom."* Without farther discussion, on the subject, the committee drafted, and the Convention adopted the provision for the employment of the military force in the suppression of insurrection.

Thus, step by step, did the Convention proceed to lay the broad foundations and rear the superstructure of a national system of government, in the discussions of which the pretensions of State sovereignty, which were urged at every step, were emphatically repudiated and disregarded. The only vestige of the Confederate idea which was permitted in the whole work, is the equal representation of the States in the Senate; a feature readily allowed, as presenting the means of erecting the Senate upon a representative basis different from that of the House,—a condition essential to constitute them mutual checks upon each other. But even this concession was deprived of all significance to the purposes of the State rights theory, by the fact that the Senate is but one of two branches of the legislature, contrary to their plan;—by the length of term assigned the Senators, for the avowed purpose of rendering them independent of State control,—by their payment out of the national treasury, designed for the same purpose;—and by the rule which provides that the Senatorial vote should be taken individually, and not by States.

Perhaps candor may be thought to demand reference to the last article of the Constitution, which is sometimes cited as decisive in favor of the Confederate interpretation of the instrument. Of how much avail it is to such a purpose, in the presence of all the facts, the reader may judge. It provides that "the ratification of the Conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same."

* Ibid, pp. 343-344.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE ARTICLES.

The essential characteristics of the instrument framed by the Convention, as compared with the Articles of Confederation, are embraced mainly in the following points :

1. The Articles were established by the State governments, without recurrence to the people, or commission from them for such a purpose in any form. They are "Articles of Confederation, and perpetual union *between the States*" enumerated ; or, rather, between the State governments. "The Constitution is the fruit of the first and only appeal ever made to the people, as to the form of government under which they choose to enjoy their liberties. Drafted by a convention appointed for that sole and express purpose," and ultimately submitted to the judgment of the people, in conventions called and elected by them for that end,—the style of the preamble truly expresses the nature of the transaction :

"We the *people of the United States*, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, *do ordain and establish* this Constitution for the United States of America."

2. The Articles of Confederation were of the nature of a compact, predicated upon the preëxistent union, and entered into between the State governments, of their own several authority. The Constitution was not a compact, but an ordinance, or constitution, in the proper sense ; which "the people of the United States," by their paramount authority, "ordain and establish" for the organization and government of the Union and subordination of the States. At first, in imitation of the Articles, the preamble to the Constitution ran in the name of "the United States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts," &c. But this phraseology was liable to a distributive interpretation, corresponding with the idea of a confederacy. It was therefore altered, the enumeration of States stricken out, and the style of "the people of the United States," adopted in its stead.

3. Under the provisions of the Articles, the general government acted upon the State authorities without any access to the people. The Constitution establishes its control over the people, in a manner as immediate and efficient as is that of the State

governments; enforcing its authority and executing its decrees upon the individual citizens by its own officers, without recourse to the State authorities, or interposition by them.

4. The Articles allowed the national government scarcely any but legislative power. It had no executive in fact, and no judiciary; and hence, no means of enforcing its enactments. The Constitution provides a legislature, executive and judiciary, with prerogatives pervading the whole Union, and paramount alike over all the authorities of the States, and every inhabitant of the country.

5. The Articles left Congress with no control over the trade and commerce of the country, and with no power to collect even those taxes which it was authorized to impose; dependent upon the discretion, the caprice, or the factious policy of thirteen distinct sets of functionaries, executive, legislative and judicial, for every dollar of revenue, and the execution of every law which it enacted, or treaty which it made. The Constitution gives the general government exclusive authority over trade and commerce, commits to its own officers the execution of its laws and treaties, and declares them paramount, "anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

6. In one respect the two documents are in perfect accord. Neither the one nor the other pretends to create or originate the Union of the States; but, recognizing it as a preëxistent fact, the articles declare that "the Union shall be perpetual," and the Constitution establishes its provisions, "in order to form a more perfect Union." But whilst, in the Articles of Confederation the perpetuity of the Union stands as a naked declaration,—the Constitution contains provisions which preclude the attempt at disunion, and annul and suppress any measures tending thereto. It provides that "No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque or reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts." "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, keep troops, or ships of war, in time of peace; enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power." Having thus provided against the organization of combined insurrection by the States, it requires that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government,"—a provision

which at once becomes nugatory, if the right of secession be recognized.

To render these provisions effectual, it gives Congress power "to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States;" and having required the President solemnly to swear or affirm, "that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States,"—it places the army, navy, and militia,—the whole power of the Union, in his hand, to be employed to that end, and charges him to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed."*

Having completed their labors, the Convention communicated the result to Congress, accompanied with a letter, in which they state the object which they had aimed to accomplish: "In all our deliberations, on this subject, we kept steadily in our view that which appears to us the greatest interest of every true American,—the consolidation of our Union,—in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety,—perhaps our national existence. This important consideration, seriously and deeply impressed on our minds, led each State in the Convention to be less rigid on points of inferior magnitude than might have been otherwise expected; and thus, the Constitution, which we now present, is the result of a spirit of amity and of mutual deference and concession, which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable."†

The Convention further stated it to Congress, as their opinion, that the Constitution, as communicated by them, "should be submitted to a convention of delegates, chosen in each State, by the people thereof, under the recommendation of its legislature, for their assent and ratification."‡

RATIFICATION OF THE CONSTITUTION.

The discussion of the Constitution was now transferred to the

* See Constitution, i, 10; iv, 4; i, 8; ii, 1-3.

† Elliott's Madison, p. 536.

‡ Ibid, p. 541.

press and popular assemblies, and to the State Conventions. Under the title of the *Federalist*, a series of articles, the joint productions of Messrs. Hamilton, Madison and Jay, were published in opposition to any plan of confederation, and in vindication of the Constitution as a national system, created not by compact of States, but by the will of the people. In these articles, Madison, from a review of the failures of former confederacies, derives this conclusion: "Experience is the oracle of truth, and where its responses are unequivocal, they ought to be conclusive and sacred. The important truth which it unequivocally pronounces in the present case is, that a sovereignty over sovereigns, a government over governments, a legislation for communities, as contradistinguished from individuals: as it is a solecism in theory, so, in practice, it is subversive of the order and ends of civil polity."* So, Hamilton declares that "The great and radical vice in the construction of the existing Confederation, is in the principle of legislation for States or governments, in their corporate or collective capacities, and as contradistinguished from the individuals of whom they consist;"—and commends the Constitution, because it "incorporates into one plan those ingredients which may be considered as forming the characteristic difference between a league and a government," and "extends the authority of the Union to the persons of the citizens—the only proper objects of government."† Again, he anticipates a sophism which has at length proved fatal to our country: "However gross a heresy it may be, to maintain that a party to a compact has a right to revoke that compact, the doctrine itself has had respectable advocates. The possibility of a question of this nature, proves the necessity of laying the foundations of our national government deeper than in the mere sanction of delegated authority. The fabric of American empire ought to rest on the solid basis of the consent of the people. The streams of national power ought to flow immediately from that pure original fountain of all legitimate authority."‡

In the State Conventions the antifederal or State rights party rallied all its strength to oppose the adoption of the Constitution. In none of these was the discussion more earnest and able, nor

* *Federalist*, No. 20.† *Ibid*, No. 15.‡ *Ibid*, No. 22.

the report more full and satisfactory, than in that of Virginia. Of the members of that Convention, no one stood more deservedly high in the public esteem and confidence, for patriotism, genius and moral worth, than Patrick Henry, the leader of the Antifederalists in that body. He had read the language in which the Convention stated to Congress the object kept by it steadily in view,—“the consolidation of the Union.” He had traced that design in every line of the document itself, and in all the subsequent discussions;—and, forgetful of the noble sentences in which, at the beginning of the revolutionary struggle, he had himself proclaimed the merging of provincial ties in the paramount claims of the Union,—his jealousy for the sovereignty of Virginia was aroused; and he urged the demand by what authority the Convention ventured upon the ground which it had assumed. “I would make this enquiry,” said the orator, “of those worthy characters who composed a part of the late federal Convention. I am sure they were fully impressed with the necessity of forming a great consolidated government, instead of a confederation. That this is a consolidated government, is demonstrably clear; and the danger of such a government is, to my mind, very striking. I have the highest veneration for those gentlemen; but, sir, give me leave to demand, what right had they to say, ‘*We, the people?*’ My political curiosity, exclusive of my anxious solicitude for the public welfare, leads me to ask,—who authorized them to speak the language of *We, the people*, instead of *We, the States?* States are the characteristics, and the soul of a confederation. If the States be not the agents of this compact, it must be one great, consolidated national government of all the people of all the States. . . . Even of that illustrious man, who saved us by his valor, I would have a reason for his conduct. That liberty which he has given us by his valor, tells me to ask this reason,—and sure I am, were he here, he would give us that reason. But there are other gentlemen here who can give us this information. *The people* gave them no power to use their name. That they exceeded their power is perfectly clear.”* . . .

Again he recurs to the subject:—“I rose on yesterday, not to enter upon the discussion, but merely to ask a question which

* Elliott's Debates, vol. iii, p. 22.

had arisen in my own mind. When I asked that question, I thought the meaning of my interrogation was obvious. The fate of America may depend on this question. Have they said, *We, the States?* Have they made a proposal of a compact between States? If they had, this would be a confederation; it is, otherwise, most clearly a consolidated government. The whole question turns on that poor little thing, the expression,—‘*We, the people,*’ instead of—*the States of America.*”*

Mr. Madison replied:—“There are a number of opinions as to the nature of the government; but the principal question is, whether it be a federal or consolidated government. In order to judge properly of the question before us, we must consider it minutely in its principal parts. I conceive, myself, that it is of a mixed nature:—it is, in a manner, unprecedented. We can not find one express example in the experience of the world,—it stands by itself. In some respects it is a government of a federal nature: in others, it is of a consolidated nature.” He then points out and discriminates its federal from its national features.†

But, said Henry: “What signifies it to me that you have the most curious anatomical description of it, in its creation? To all the common purposes of legislation it is a great consolidation of government.”‡

Such were the lights in which the Constitution was presented by its advocates, and assailed by its opponents, and in view of which it was finally adopted by the people of the United States. By that adoption, it and the treaties and laws of the United States, “made in pursuance thereof,” became,—according to the express terms of its own articles,—“the supreme law of the land,” binding the judiciary, State as well as National, “any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.”§

RESERVED RIGHTS.

In perfect harmony with all the provisions in the body of the Constitution, is the language of Articles ix and x, of the amend-

* Ibid, p. 44.

† Ibid, p. 94.

‡ Ibid, p. 171.

§ Constitution, Article vi. 2.

ments, subsequently adopted:—"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." In the first of these articles, certain rights are spoken of which are "retained *by* the people," to-wit: "the people of the United States," the parties by whom the Constitution was "ordained and established;" and who are thus distinctly recognized as the alone authors, alike, of the delegations of authority to the national government, and the reservations from it. In the next article, powers are spoken of as reserved, not *by*, but "to the States respectively." The significance of the change of expression here marked, must be apparent to every candid mind. Its effect in determining that "the people of the United States," and not "the States severally," are the authors of the Constitution, is not weakened by the form of the last clause, which, by the force of attraction, assimilates with that immediately preceding: "Reserved *to* the States respectively, or *to* the people." The people having so emphatically, just before, as well as elsewhere, asserted their authority and the agency in the premises, could well afford here to use a modified phrase, in deference to the jealous feelings of the States, who were so reluctantly restricted to a subordinate position.

Of all this, however, the essential matter is, that here, as well as throughout the entire Constitution, three several parties are distinctly recognized, as invested with rights and prerogatives of government. These are "the people of the United States," the national government, and "the States respectively." The first of these are not only the authors of the Constitution, but the paramount sovereign, which therein delegates to the general government its powers; imposes limitations upon those of the States respectively; reserves to them their legitimate functions, and retains the remainder, by the express reservation "to the States or *to the people*." If, therefore, a given prerogative is not, in the Constitution, delegated to the general government, it by no means follows, that it of course belongs to the States respectively. The functions of the latter are limited by two express restrictions, namely, the prohibitions of the Constitution, and the reservations of the people. Among the former are included

any violation of the laws, Constitution and treaties of the United States. These are paramount even to the State constitutions, which are the highest possible expressions of the sovereignty of the people of the States severally. In the same category is to be enumerated all questions of constitutional interpretation; or, in other words, of the prerogatives and limitations of the various departments of the national government,—questions which are expressly reserved to the courts of the United States.

From these restrictions, so expressly marked, it is manifest, that according to the Constitution, it does not belong to the States to interpose their authority, under the pretense of reserved rights, for the correction of evils arising in the general government, or for curbing usurpations attempted by it. This belongs to the people, whose creature it is, and to whom only by the provisions of the Constitution it is subordinate and responsible. Any attempt, therefore, by State governments to arrogate such authority is, not only a dereliction from their duty to the general government, but a high crime against the people of the nation, whose rights they thus usurp. The recourse of States, as well as of individuals must, in such case, be to those means and tribunals which the Constitution itself erects and designates. To suppose these to be set aside, under any pretense of authority, State or national, if persisted in, implies, not casual disorder, but revolution; for which there is no remedy but the sword.

THE RESULTS.

Thus was perfected the organism of that great nation whose amazing growth, prosperity and power constitute, at once, the most conspicuous fact, and the most pregnant cause, in the history of an age of wonders,—transforming by the influence of its silent example, the whole face of Europe, and inspiring with new and high hope the friends of man. Originally identified with Britain, as integral parts of one great nation,—yet more intimately related to each other, as dwellers in one land, cherishing the same habits and sympathies, sharers of common privations and toils, heirs of the same rights of freemen, and objects of the same aggressions and hostilities from the crown and parliament,—the influences which sundered the ties that bound them to the mother country, were so far from tending to disunite them from each other, that they only rendered the Union the more

necessary and cherished. The only modes in which their native connection with each other could have been dissolved, and distinct nationalities instituted among them, were the separate adoption by them severally, of ordinances of independence; or, subsequent withdrawal from the Union, after independence had been achieved,—a step which would have been as important in itself, and as momentous in its results as the separation from Britain.

From the history here traced, it appears that the occasion of the revolutionary conflict was the invasion by the British government of the rights of sovereign and exclusive jurisdiction by the several colonies over their own internal affairs,—rights guaranteed by charters which, in the language of Massachusetts, to Lord Camden, rendered the “legislative bodies in America, as perfectly free as a subordination to the supreme legislative would admit.”

It further appears that the Continental Congress, when convened at the beginning of the struggle, conscious of an essential unity which required no other bond, altogether neglected to enter into any form of mutual alliance, compact, or union; but proceeded at once in the name of “The United Colonies,” with the cordial sanction of the entire loyal population, to assume and exercise, in the most efficient and decisive manner, the authority and prerogatives of paramount sovereignty,—organizing a “continental army;” electing and commissioning a commander-in-chief, and other officers; creating a navy; issuing letters of marque and reprisal; organizing a post-office; emitting bills of credit; forbidding commercial intercourse with Britain and its dependencies; holding diplomatic correspondence with the other powers of Europe; and, at length, in the name and by the authority of the good people of the colonies, dissolving the political bands which had connected them with Great Britain, and decreeing their entrance as one people, in a separate and equal station among the powers of the earth. Of this central authority the voice of Washington testifies that in accepting the command at the first, and leading the armies of American liberty, his confidence under God was in the justice of the cause, and “the support of the *supreme power of the Union.*”

It appears that, so far was the Union from being formed by a delegation of power, on the part of the State authorities,—the

converse is true. Amid the ruins of the royal governments, the provincial or State organizations were not erected, until application had been made to Congress for direction on the subject, and its sanction and instructions had first been obtained. And if, subsequently, the State authorities, acting under influences which we have here pointed out, seized the opportunity presented by the unorganized condition of the central power, and its consequent weakness, to usurp prerogatives which were practically incompatible with the perpetuation of the Union, the wrong was at once corrected, upon the first appeal to the American people, by the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, and the appointment of the father of his country to inaugurate its provisions.

Two important conclusions follow from these facts:

First. That the exclusive and sovereign jurisdiction of the States, severally, over their internal affairs, constitutes a primitive and fundamental datum of American history; and, except so far as it has been surrendered or limited by the people in the provisions of the Constitution, still remains, invested with the same authority, fortified by the same sanctions, and unalterable except in the same mode as the Constitution itself,—by the will and authority of the whole people, acting in their sovereign capacity in the mode which the Constitution prescribes.

Second. That the unity of the American people,—the Union of the States as one nation,—is a fact equally primitive and fundamental with the other. From the first settlement of a British colony on the coast until the investiture of Washington as President of the United States, there never was an hour in which any colony or State claimed a separate national status and independent supremacy. There never was a time when the supreme authority of the thirteen colonies was not a unit. The representation of that supremacy,—at first vested in the British Crown and Parliament,—was then transferred to the Continental Congress, and held and exercised by it without question or interruption, alike, during the struggle which preceded the declaration of independence,—between that epoch and the adoption of the Articles of Confederation,—and from that adoption until the ratification of the Constitution and establishment of the present form of government. From the beginning, any attempt, by one of the States, to separate itself from the Con-

tinental Union, would have been resisted as an act of violence to its own native position, relations and interests, and of treason to the Constitution and rights of the whole body, of which it formed a part. The attempt would have been rebellion, and success revolution.

While, therefore, on the one hand, any interference by the general government with the internal affairs of the States,—except as far as expressly authorized by the Constitution,—must be regarded as a usurpation, identical in its nature with that which impelled the Colonies to separate from Great Britain;—on the other hand,—not only by virtue of the express provisions of the Constitution,—but, because of the original, essential and unbroken unity and sovereignty of the American people, and Union of the States, “secession is treason.” Should the Constitution be abrogated to-morrow, and the government dissolved, the Union,—the nation,—would still remain; and would be abundantly competent, in the majesty of its ultimate supremacy, to ordain and establish a new Constitution, and call a new set of officers to administer its affairs and see that the republic should suffer no detriment.

ART. III.—*The Army Chaplain's Manual*, by Rev. J. Pinkney Hammond. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1863.

THE preface of this book declares that it was written to supply “a want which has been long felt in the chaplain's department of the Army.” Such a want no doubt really did exist and was felt by many chaplains and others, in and out of the army. Having seen the work whose title stands at the head of this article, warmly commended by a prominent religious journal, of the city of New York, we bought the book the first time we came across it. We must confess it disappointed us. It is not what we expected, much less what we would desire, on such a topic especially at the present time. True, the author makes many good suggestions, but nearly all of them are quite commonplace. We surely do not flatter chaplains when we assert that nineteen out of every twenty of them could have written two-thirds of this book, and that fully one-half of it would not

seem to them necessary to be written at all, at least in a work designed for the instruction of chaplains. This Manual is too elementary, it contains too much that a chaplain ought to know, and may well be presumed to have already learned. It would do very well for a young man just beginning to preach, and much better for one just commencing a course of theological study. But of all ministers, the chaplain needs to be "not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the Devil." May we not presume that a chaplain knows he needs personal religion. It is proper, and perhaps necessary, to insist that he should be an unusually devout minister. Certainly he needs to be put on his guard, lest insensibly he fall away from the standard of personal piety, to which both he himself, and those around him, held him at home, "lest," to take the words which the Holy Ghost useth, he "be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin." This is a point which we should have been glad to have seen made more distinct and prominent in the Army Chaplain's Manual." For this purpose we could have spared much that Mr. Hammond says of prayer, personal religion and kindred topics. We could have spared it, not because it is not all very true and very good, but because we would take it for granted that the chaplain has the general primary qualifications of the Christian and the minister. If it be urged that there are chaplains belonging to sects which do not require personal religion in their religious teachers, and that some who did not belong to any sect or church have served as chaplains in the army, we answer that Mr. Hammond himself declares, and we think with entire truth, that the "recent legislation of Congress" has had the effect in a great measure, if not altogether, to remove this latter anomaly, and has brought "a superior class of men" into this branch of the service. And if there be here and there an occasional Unitarian, or Universalist, or a Swedenborgian, who has been from childhood imbued with the peculiar views of those sects (and much more if he have gone over to them from the bosom of some orthodox church), who has age and force of character enough to render him at all qualified to act as chaplain, we do not think he is likely to have his views changed by the two or three pages on personal religion which he will encounter in the Army Chaplain's Manual. Nor can we see why it is necessary in writing for men who think (and certainly

chaplains ought to belong to that class), after having said that chaplains must have a conformity of soul to their work, must be earnest in it, must be men of prayer, and have spiritual gifts, attainments and knowledge, to write in addition three or four pages upon the necessity of personal religion. Does not personal religion include all these? Can one truly have any of them, and much more all, and not have personal religion? Oh, that in the place of these dull lifeless repetitions, Mr. Hammond had given us some clear, simple, pointed words, that were suited to the hour, and would thus have done good for all time to come.

The book seems to us far better adapted to the hospital than to the camp. The writer appears all the while to have before his mind's eye, a large commodious building with its well furnished wards and orderly arrangements. There is seldom anything in this Manual which "a plain man dwelling in tents" would feel was specially designed for him. There is more good sound sense, in an article in the June number of this Review, by Dr. Landis, than in this whole book. Take for instance the following advice as to what Mr. Hammond calls the chaplain's pastoral work.

"Much has frequently been said in the same connection, and with equal want of discrimination, about 'laboring personally' with the men for their salvation. And rules are not unfrequently laid down for guidance in the matter by those who, on the score of practical knowledge, prudence, or remarkable preëminence in any of the Christian virtues, are the least qualified to advert to the subject at all. But any one who will cast his eye over the aforesaid specification of the obstacles in the way of the chaplain, as he enters upon his field, with ten or twelve hundreds of men under his charge, will not need that we here stop in order to repel such presumption. The gifts of Christ's ministers are various. But every true minister will, on surveying his field, pursue that course in which he believes he can accomplish most good. The matter should be left to him, without subjecting him to the annoyance of dictation and intermeddling on the part of those, who while they sustain no portion of the mental burden of his responsibilities, are in no way capacitated to offer him either counsel or suggestion. Should a similar intermeddling be attempted in the case of the surgeons, captains, colonel, or any other officers in the army, its authors would soon be taught, and in a way that would insure the remembrance of the lesson, that it became them to confine their attention to matters which are legitimately within the scope of their talents

"and attainments. Let us hope that there may be no occasion ever to refer to this subject again."

Chaplain Hammond on this same point of personal labor, is quite proper and correct, but there is a sound healthy tone, a practical good sense, in the suggestions of Dr. Landis, which we have failed to discover, except occasionally, in the Army Chaplain's Manual. Every chaplain who has been with men in a campaign, will feel that Dr. Landis understands our position and gives good advice. We do not know that he could do anything like as well for hospital chaplains, and perhaps there is here another illustration of the wisdom condensed in the saying *ne sutor ultra crepidam*.

Bearing in mind this aphorism we shall confine our strictures to such parts of this work as have reference to chaplains in general, or where we happen to find anything of the kind, to chaplains in the field. And our first objection, not first by any means in the order of importance, but the first distinct issue that we made with the author when we took up his book to read it through regularly, is one that brings us into collision, not only with Mr. Hammond, but we fear also with the great majority of religious people in civil life. The Army Chaplain's Manual declares, not only plainly but peremptorily, and with an air that indicates that the point is not to be called in question, that chaplains do not need and ought not to have any rank. We can not coincide with this view, though, as we have already intimated, we suppose the majority at home would at once agree to it. We suppose so because the religious papers that commended the Army Chaplain's Manual did not dissent from it on this point, and in no religious periodical have we ever seen the question discussed, or hardly ever even a passing allusion to it. The religious press must be accepted as indicating, if not controlling public sentiment upon all such topics. Our own connection with the service is too recent, and has not brought us into sufficient contact with those who may be regarded as controlling or even reflecting the feeling of the army on this point, to authorize us to speak either for officers or men. We have good authority, however, for saying that the question is often discussed, especially among thorough soldiers. It is not regarded as a matter unworthy of consideration, nor is it by any means so clear to the

majority of those who consider it, as it seems to be to Mr. Hammond, that the chaplain should have no rank. We can safely say for ourselves that we have never thoroughly discussed the question with any thoughtful person, in the army or out of it, who fully comprehended the sphere of a chaplain's duties, who did not believe a serious mistake had been committed in refusing him definite rank. Even where the first impression, without reflection, had been the other way, when the matter was attentively considered, invariably the conclusion has been reached that rank would at least be no disadvantage. We hope to show, with all due deference to the author of this book, and all who agree with him, that the contrary opinion is the result of want of consideration, or ignorance of the chaplain's place and duties. The ignorance of which we speak is, of course, mainly of that practical kind which arises from inexperience.

The first reason we would give why the chaplain should have rank, is that we have never seen any good reason why he should not. Every other officer, and we take it for granted the chaplain is, and ought to be an officer, has some rank. This principle extends to every branch of the service, to surgeons, engineers, pioneers, and all employed in the army, at least all who really *belong* to it. The chaplain's duties are no more unlike those of a colonel or captain, than are those of the surgeon. Then why not treat him as you do the surgeon? Let him perform only the duties appropriate to his office and his calling, let him be known only as the chaplain, but give him at the same time some military rank. Where is the harm? Why make a solitary exception of the chaplain? Chaplain Hammond tells us why. Let us see what he says:

"It can not, therefore, fail to exert an injurious effect upon religion
"and hinder the progress of the gospel, when those who are looked to as
"examples in humility and deemed to be above the love of earthly power
"and distinction, are found contending about questions of rank, and
"seeking to exert an authority which was never claimed by Him who
"has emphatically said, 'my kingdom is not of this world.' The chap-
"lain's business is to preach, persuade, reprove and exhort, but not to
"command, and it is a virtual lowering of his office, an apparent laying
"aside of the high and holy commission which he has received from
"God when he seeks to accomplish in any degree by means of military
"authority and rank, that which alone can result from the outpouring of

"the Holy Spirit on faithful and humble labors in the Redeemer's service."

But can not a man have rank, and at the same time be humble and above all sinful love of power and distinction? Must such an one be necessarily contentious about questions of rank? Was this the case with Commodore Foote? Is it so now with General Howard, General Burnside, and General Meade, and our other Christian Generals? Would Chaplain Hammond have us infer that this was or is true of him, who he himself styles, "that great and good man, General McClellan?" Surely rank does not thus affect one who is either truly great or truly good. The argument is that the chaplain should not have rank because it will make him haughty and jealous, at least this is taken for granted and lies at the foundation of all that is said. Then we say no Christian soldier should accept military rank, or seek advancement; if this be its necessary or normal result, he should shun it as he would a contagious fever. But we think a man may have a definite position in the service and be neither suspicious nor contentious about it. He may be as humble on horseback with a little star on his shoulder, as on foot with a heavy musket instead of the star. Chaplain Hammond must have been unfortunate in his association with those who have rank, if he has come to think that pride and contention are inseparable from shoulder straps. We have known scores of officers, from the highest to the lowest grade, some of them professing Christians, and some of them not, whose possession of rank has had no such unhappy effect either upon their morals or their manners. Can not a chaplain be humble and modest, and yet be regarded as legally upon a level with a captain or a lieutenant? Does Mr. Hammond mean to say that he is weaker than other Christian men? more liable to have his head turned by such ephemeral distinctions? "It can not fail to exert an injurious effect upon religion" if he is a proud, jealous man, whether in the army or out of it, whether with rank, or without. What is said about exacting an authority never claimed by our Lord, and seeking to accomplish by military authority what alone can result from spiritual influences, would be appropriate if a chaplain should seek to use his rank to oblige men to repent and be baptised. We have heard of a New York colonel, who, on learning that

the chaplain of a rival regiment had immersed half a dozen soldiers on the preceding Sabbath, immediately ordered his adjutant to detail fifteen men for baptism, but we hardly think any chaplain, even if you give him the rank of Major General, would follow the colonel's example. You might as well say the surgeon should not rank as Major, lest he endeavor to control disease by military authority, instead of the remedial agents which God himself has appointed and provides. This entire paragraph is based upon the principle, that there is one kind of humility for the Christian minister, and another for the Christian layman, one spirit for a chaplain and another for a colonel. Indeed the whole chapter is saturated with this feeling, which pervades the book. We need not stop to show the falsity of such an opinion. It is a most subtle and dangerous heresy, which is constantly plaguing and poisoning the church. It appears, and reappears in a thousand different forms, men who contend against one phase of it readily falling in with another. One temper of heart, and one rule of life, for all the Lord's people is the clear teaching of the book of God. True, there are proprieties varying with circumstances which every minister in or out of the army ought to observe. Chaplains should be wise to discover and prompt to observe those appropriate to their sphere. We have never been able to see how giving a chaplain rank would infract these proprieties or hinder his perception and observance of them.

Mr. Hammond says chaplains need no rank, that the chaplain "knows that a consistent walk in life, and a practical exemplification in himself of the holy precepts of the gospel, will secure for him, at all times, the respect of those with whom he is thrown in constant contact; that uniform kindness, gentleness, and an affectionate interest in the temporal and spiritual welfare of the soldiers under his care, will secure their love and esteem, and these will be always accompanied by obedience in all cases where obedience is desired." If this is good reasoning, if it be true in the army, why not in civil life? Would Mr. Hammond consent that ministers should be deprived of citizenship, disfranchised, denied the right of resort to the civil courts, and made to depend for respect and influence, and even for safety, upon uniform kindness, gentleness, and an affectionate interest in the temporal and spiritual welfare of their fellow citizens? Will not

a consistent walk in life secure for them respect at home? Surely Mr. Hammond must be aware that there are men all around the minister in civil life, who are kept from annoying and possibly injuring him, by the wholesome restraints of authority. Are no such men to be found in the army? Or do they lose all this evil temper in becoming soldiers? Ordinarily, no doubt, a chaplain will find that genuine kindness, and manly Christian conduct secure respect. Every chaplain will testify to the honor of our citizen soldiery, that the occasions are rare, and to him surprising, where he needs anything more. But it will not do to depend "always" and "in all cases" upon these. He may come in contact with those so degraded, or so intoxicated, as to be insensible to all his gracious qualities. Then let him have some authority that he may rightfully exert. We may be told that he is under the protection of the military authorities, and should apply to them in any emergency. But suppose they refuse, or, which is far more likely, and we fear sometimes happens, they neglect to aid him, shall he be utterly powerless? Ought he not to have some definite rank, with its appropriate place and legal rights upon which he may fall back in extreme and urgent cases. Ordinarily at home, a minister is protected by public opinion, and his personal character, but sometimes he finds those who have respect for neither. Or the lines fall to him in some unpleasant place where public sentiment is depraved and vitiated, where it is fashionable to annoy and ridicule, even to insult and injure pious people, especially ministers, and leading men themselves set the example. In such a place the minister may at times need to invoke the power of the law to secure respect and quiet, and he is a poor, weak man if, when necessary, he do not do so. Probably Mr. Hammond has never lived in such a place. We do not wish to see him suffer, (though our readers will imagine, we fear, that his book has worried us not a little,) still, before another edition of the Army Chaplain's Manual is issued, we should be glad if its author could spend a few months in some such benighted spot. Perhaps he would discover that in this wicked world, a consistent walk in life will not "at all times" secure respectful treatment from those with whom we come in contact.

It may be said that this reasoning is faulty because Mr. Hammond does not deny, and does not wish to deny, the chaplain the common rights of a citizen at home, and an officer in the

army. Chaplain Hammond, we observe by the way, ignores altogether the chaplain's position as *an officer of the army*, and this is no small part of our complaint against his book. We shall recur to it hereafter. But his argument in the paragraph under consideration, as also in the one previously quoted, is that the chaplain is to rely only on kindness, gentleness and a consistent life. We contend that this is a mistake. It might work well, and no doubt would, in a quiet, orderly hospital, where men's hearts were softened by suffering, or their bodies were so weakened by disease that they had no strength to be obstreperous or unruly. Just as the same theory might work well at home in some cushioned and carpeted church, or with a well-bred decorous congregation. But the chaplain in the field will sometimes feel his need of authority, and, if he be "the right man in the right place," will exercise it, if he can only be sure that he has a right to do so. The misfortune of his present situation without rank is that he does not know, and no one can tell him, what authority he has, or whether he has any.*

But we may be told that giving chaplains rank allows them not only the general rights of an officer, but some special privileges. We do not see that this is so, but we do not care to argue the matter. For the possession of some special privileges is neither unchristian nor unclerical. Paul asserted his rank when he told the Philippian sergeants that the magistrates had beaten him and his companion "openly uncondemned being Romans." He did the same thing when he told the chief captain Lysias, not in pride, but with true Christian nobility of soul, "I was free born." This was no common heritage of his race, much less of all men, but a high and rare distinction. There was no harm in having it, and certainly none in using it at the right time and in the proper spirit.

The ecclesiastical argument, if we may separate it from the Scriptural, is also in favor of rank. In all Churches of the Pres-

* Dr. Landis in his article takes the ground that the chaplain has both rank and authority. We are confident he does this without having examined the question, especially as to rank, and also because his own good judgment taught him that the chaplain ought to have them. He was too considerate and had too much experience to go astray on that point. Chaplain Hammond is right as to the fact, Dr. Landis as to the principle.

byterian and Episcopal families* the minister has rank. Some persons may be startled by this use of the word, they may dislike it in this connection. But it is plain that in all these churches the minister has a definite position with specific duties, different from, and some of them in their very nature superior to, those of the laity. He has his own proper place accorded to him by the laws of the church, on account of his supposed peculiar fitness to perform the duties belonging to that place. He has certain privileges and advantages that he may better perform those duties. This is precisely our idea of military rank. Its rights and duties, as is just and proper, stand in close and exact correlation. The higher an officer's rank, the graver are his responsibilities; the more difficult his duties the more severe and lofty the standard by which he is to be judged. The notion that rank is a trivial distinction, invented for the personal advantage of the man upon whom it is conferred, is a vulgar prejudice to which the chaplain of St. John's Hospital, United States Army, ought to be superior. We do not think General Grant or General Rosecrans, entertain any such idea. Nor do true soldiers anywhere. The rank of an officer is given him that he may better perform his duties, not for his own good, but for the good of the service. So, too, as we have intimated, the minister's place in the Church is given him for the same purpose. We see no harm in saying that he has rank. Certainly in all the churches of which we have spoken, the minister has authority. It is not true among them that the minister's "business is to preach, persuade, reprove, and exhort, *but not to command*," though it may be so in the Church to which Mr. Hammond belongs. We do not know with what body of Christian people he is connected, but we trust they would not indorse this denial of authority to the Christian minister. Has he not read so much as this, that Paul told Timothy to teach and command, and Titus to exhort and rebuke with all authority? Did not this same Apostle write to the Thessalonians, "We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you, and are over you in the Lord?" and to the Hebrew Christians, "obey them that have the rule

* Under this title we include of course not merely the denominations to which these names are popularly applied, but all affiliated bodies, such as the Lutheran, German Reformed, Dutch Reformed and Methodist Episcopal churches, and all whose form of Government is of the Presbyterian or Episcopal type.

over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls?" Of course this authority is of God, and not man, spiritual and not earthly, not relating to worldly matters. This makes it none the less authority, which gives the minister the right to speak for God in the tone of command. And so the Church gives him rank, because God invests him with authority as an ambassador and a herald. We use the word rank of course in this connection in no invidious sense. Nor is there anything invidious in the use of it in the Army, at least not among good soldiers. The case of a minister in the Church and that of an officer in the army, are of course not precisely parallel; few things in this world are. But we wish to show that the idea of rank, of specific duties and special advantages for their performance, is not foreign to the religion of Him who was meek and lowly of heart.

Mr. Hammond says the question of rank is of little importance to the chaplain. Admitting this to be true, the question yet remains whether the interests of the service do not require that he should have rank. We think they do. Regard for rank, is a spirit which is and ought to be cultivated in the army. It is an element of strength, promoting, when rightly directed, order, discipline, efficiency, and everything that tends to make men good soldiers. The true soldier, no matter where his place, in the ranks or on the staff, understands and acknowledges this. You will not find him disparaging rank. Now, the present position of the chaplain is an anomaly. An officer, and yet not an officer, he depends for his influence not at all upon rank. His presence is a constant protest against the importance attached to rank. He is made to rely for influence simply upon his personal character. It is of the utmost importance, of course, that every officer should be a man whom soldiers can respect, should have a character worthy of his position. The promptness with which unworthy men are dismissed, shows that this is understood in our army; but is it not a mistake in an organization where rank is made so much of, where every one should be imbued with respect for it, to have, without rank, one who fills an important position, who needs respect and must have influence? Is not this saying in effect that it is a mistake to put such an estimate upon rank, and that military life is altogether artificial, founded on false notions of what is right and proper?

This is a dangerous position to assume, especially in our intercourse with soldiers. For the moment you take this ground you make the soldier *feel*, whatever you may say, that every time he salutes an officer, simply because he is an officer, he is acting a lie. His whole life as a soldier may thus appear to him unnatural, theatrical, a mere piece of acting. It would of course be a sad thing for a chaplain to be such a man that the soldiers have no respect for him, and pay only an outward deference to his rank. So it is as truly unfortunate (though of course not near so much so), for men to have a colonel or a captain who has not such a character as to inspire esteem. But suppose the chaplain is a faithful, laborious man, making no more show of his rank, and depending no more on it, than many a general does. Suppose he is humble and devout, suppose he has all the qualifications a chaplain ought to have, (and surely he may have all these and yet have rank too), will rank hurt him? Will it hinder his usefulness? Will it not be an advantage to the service to have the weight of his personal character thrown into the scale in favor of the soldier's respect for rank? If it be said that the men will think more of him, at least some of them, if he be without rank, we answer that this is one reason why you should give it to him. Not that you may lessen his influence, but that you may not set him in opposition to, and lessen the rightful influence of those in authority who must assert their rank. The argument answers itself. We must not encourage the feeling that a man is to be liked better because he has no rank. This would destroy the life and spirit of the army. We should rather encourage all to respect, not simply authority, but the position occupied by those in authority, a point upon which the American mind needs some training. This is not a servile temper, but a manly recognition of the fact that it is necessary and even better for some to command and others to obey. Giving the chaplain rank will promote this feeling, and we do not see how it can interfere with his spiritual functions. The number is small with whom he would have more influence if deprived of rank, and they do not belong to that class of men of whom good soldiers are made. Nor do we think they generally belong to that truly "better class" who were not far from the Kingdom of Heaven. The feeling, wherever found, is always unmanly and often sinful, the result of ignorance, or spite, or both com-

bined. Certainly it is a feeling to which the chaplain should never pander, and of which he ought not to be afraid. Whether with rank or without it himself, as the pastor of soldiers, he should inculcate and exhibit a proper respect for rank, and he need not fear it for himself. He can pray and preach just as well if he ranks as a captain or a major, as in his present anomalous position. Rank would in some respects be an advantage to him. It would put him at his ease, he would know just where his place was, just who had a right to control him.

By giving him rank we believe you will lessen his temptations. In his present relations to the service is he in no danger of seeking influence and power by unmilitary methods, in ways unbecoming an officer, even, if we do not add, in true martial style, "and a gentleman?" If you make him depend altogether upon "kindness, gentleness, and an affectionate interest in the welfare" of the men, are not these liable to degenerate into the low arts of a popularity hunter? Or may he not be tempted to assert for himself a position not accorded him by law, and exert an influence in virtue of his personal character, that will bring him into antagonism more or less direct with the commander of his regiment? Are we told to rely upon his Christian principle to prevent this? Then, we ask, why not rely upon that, too, to keep him from being haughty and jealous if you give him rank? In an organization where respect for authority is so vital and all-pervading, we think the former class of temptations more probable and more powerful, so that you show kindness to the chaplain by putting him out of the way of and above them, by giving him a definite place.

To test the soundness of this reasoning let us apply it to the case of the surgeon. We can not see that he needs rank any more than the chaplain. Many of the reasons why the latter should occupy his present position apply with equal, and some of them with added, force to the former. Suppose, then, you give the surgeon no rank. Evidently his position would be an uncertain, and so far an uncomfortable one. Obligated to depend for all influence upon his personal intercourse with the men, doing them the greatest favors, meeting them in the tenderest and most impressible moments, will he not be tempted to compensate himself for the manifest uncertainty of his position among the officers, by securing for himself a higher place in the

affections of the men? You secure him from this by giving him an assured place, letting him know just where he belongs and what he has a right to do. Do this for the chaplain, and you will help him, you will help the service, and you will hurt no one. Give the chaplain rank, and trust him as a man and a Christian that he "will not, for a moment, suffer questions of rank and position to draw off his heart from the work which is ever before him."*

If we are asked what rank the chaplain should have, we would say that of captain seems to us the most appropriate. This puts him on a level with the company commanders, and gives him free access to all the men. It puts him under the control of the field officers, and, as he ought to be, of the chief surgeon of the regiment. It is also about the rank that is indicated by the pay that he receives. But this is a matter that would not long trouble those in authority when once it is settled that the chaplain should have rank. This latter question we now leave, though we have not said all that might be urged in the affirmative. No thorough soldier, or considerate patriot, no thoughtful Christian will consider the matter as unworthy of his attention. Whatever is worth doing at all for our army, is worth doing well. The chaplaincy is so powerful, so useful and indispensable a branch of the service, that we can not afford to deny it anything that will increase, or attach to it, anything that will impair its efficiency.

We are not sure, by the way, but that even Mr. Hammond agrees with us as to the importance of rank. What mean those talismanic letters, M. A., attached to his name on the title page of the *Army Chaplain's Manual*. Not every chaplain has the right to adopt such a style. Does not Mr. Hammond expect us to receive his suggestions with more deference, when we see that he has risen to the dignity of *Magister Artium*? Do not these letters indicate literary rank? To us they look like a sort of collegiate shoulder-strap.

This brings us to what Mr. Hammond has said of the chaplain's uniform. In the main we agree with him, and should pass this point in silence, but that here, as in what he says of rank, he betrays a shrinking from shoulder-straps as if there

* *Army Chaplain's Manual*, p. 24.

were something unchristian about them. We think with him, that the propriety of having a plain uniform for the chaplain is apparent to all. He adds, however, that "There is a natural repugnance in the human heart at beholding a minister of Jesus Christ arrayed in all the habiliments of war, and wearing the insignia of military rank and authority *which does not belong to him.*"* But what if they *do* belong to him? We doubt whether this "repugnance" is altogether "natural." May it not be the result of education or thoughtlessness, or perhaps prejudice? And even if you prove that it is natural, this does not assure us that it is right. We do not know to what school of theologians Mr. Hammond belongs any more than with what church he is connected. From the general tenor of his book we should say he believed in original sin; or, as it is often popularly styled, native depravity. But here he seems to take it for granted that this "natural repugnance of the human heart" is, of course, praiseworthy. We want something more than its mere naturalness to canonize it for us. Mr. Hammond thinks the love of display manifested by some chaplains, in the earlier stages of the war, "has contributed much toward creating a prejudice against chaplains as a class." We are confident he over-estimates the force of this feeling. Certainly it did not create the prejudice against chaplains.

This prejudice existed before a solitary chaplain had put on "the habiliments of war," and has itself sometimes contributed to produce the "repugnance" at seeing them "wearing the insignia of military rank and authority." As a matter of taste we decidedly prefer a plain uniform for the chaplain. So that, when Mr. Hammond says, "the sight of a chaplain arrayed in the uniform of a captain, with shoulder-straps, and sword and belt, and sash and revolver, is one of rare occurrence," we do not complain. But we would ask him if there is any "sin per se" in wearing these insignia. If so, let no Christian colonel put them on. And we dislike very much to have him intimate that the chaplains thus arrayed have not been found "clear in their great office." It so happens that the writer of this article wears a uniform, just such as Chaplain Hammond says is in accordance with the order of the Secretary of War, and such as

*We are not responsible for the grammar of this sentence.

"may with propriety be worn." But he must say that some of the most faithful, humble, and laborious chaplains he has met, he found "arrayed in the uniform of a captain, with shoulder-straps, and sword and belt, and sash." The revolver he did not see, but he presumes it was somewhere in the neighborhood. And we can tell Mr. Hammond, from personal experience, that if his regiment were guarding railroad in a country infested by guerrillas, and he, if he would be faithful, obliged to go from post to post, often alone, he might find even such a carnal weapon as a revolver not altogether out of place. We think with our author that the question of dress is a matter of secondary importance, and are content with the uniform of a chaplain as at present ordered by the Secretary of War. But we never could see any objection to his wearing a neat, modest shoulder-strap, appropriate to whatever rank he might have. There is one reason, for the sake of others, why this should be done. It would serve as a protest against the foolish notion that other officers wear their shoulder straps out of weak or sinful vanity, and that there is something unchristian in such marks of rank. We do not wear shoulder-straps, and do not seek to, but we have no prejudice against them. In the army we are taught to respect them as signs of authority. This is no childish weakness, but the true soldierly feeling, a feeling to be encouraged and cultivated. As there is nothing unchristian in wearing such badges, so the greatest stickler for propriety can not show that there is anything unclerical in them. In some parts of the country every minister is expected to wear a white cravat. No one objects to this. It shows the possessor's place in society, just as the shoulder strap marks a man's place in the army. There is nothing in the adoption of either necessarily vain or sinful, though both may minister to the vanity of a weak mind.

Every other officer wears this badge of rank and duty. Why make a solitary exception of the chaplain? Surely no man will say that he is more liable than other officers to be tempted to a vain display. We grant that it is more offensive in him, and this is as it should be. But the true method of avoiding this disgust is to have the right kind of men as chaplains. We think, with Mr. Hammond, that the Acts of Congress now in force are sufficient to secure that result. We dislike to see the

Christian minister treated like a child who must have these toys put out of his sight, or at least out of his reach, for fear he will think too much of them. We might as well deny him by Constitutional provision the right to hold civil office, lest he should degenerate into a politician, as we believe has been done at times under the pretence of honoring the ministry, but, really, though perhaps not purposely, to their disparagement if not to their disgrace. Are we weaker than other Christians? Do we need to hang out any such flag of distress? You degrade the Christian ministry by such special enactments in its behalf. We protest against nursing so carefully him who is to be an ensample to the flock, treating him like some tender exotic, shutting him up that not the slightest breath of temptation may come upon the leaf that must not wither. Even the summer breeze of military insignia must not visit his cheek too roughly. Is this the way to make a Christian hero? Treat the minister as you do other men, treat the chaplain as you do other officers. True, you must guard him from temptation, and especially from those to which he is most liable, from those, as we have already intimated, that are most dangerous and most powerful. But there are some temptations from which you should trust him to keep himself. The genius of Christianity is to substitute for external restraint internal and personal self-control. This ought to show itself, and have a chance to show itself in the teacher of Christianity. If a Christian general is to wear shoulder straps and not be vain, let the chaplain show that he can do so too.

We are afraid that Mr. Hammond's method of weeding out all love of display in addition to its other faults is not likely to succeed. We are not sure that he himself is altogether free from a little harmless vanity. Why does he write his name, J. Pinkney Hammond, instead of John P. or James P., leaving us to guess what the P stands for, rather than envelope the letter J with such an air of mystery, while he parades the Pinkney before the eyes of those who have no such illustrious patronymic to exhibit? Some unfaithful chaplain, arrayed in captain's uniform, might quote for Mr. Hammond's benefit the saying of the Apostle, "Wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself."

But the secret, and no doubt unconscious inspiration of much

that Mr. Hammond says in regard both to rank and uniform, is, we fear, a deep seated conviction that the life of the Soldier and that of the Christian are, after all, really incompatible. Hence his constant aim, and that of those who agree with him, is to make the chaplain as unmilitary as possible. The Army Chaplain's Manual is pervaded by this disposition, and it is against this feature of the book that we desire chiefly to protest in the name of every thoughtful Christian soldier. The calling of the military man is not inconsistent with the practice of any Christian virtue, or the performance of any Christian duty. Some Christian graces seem to flourish best in camp. Many a chaplain, many a pastor at home, might sit at the feet of Havelock, or Hedley Vicers, or Foote, to say nothing of living Christian heroes. Yet these men were true soldiers. They valued rank in the proper way. They wore its appropriate badges, they enforced discipline. May not a chaplain do the same? We would make the chaplain a thorough soldier, as much so as the surgeon, the quartermaster, or the engineer. He need not drill any more than they do. But we would imbue him with the *esprit de corps* of the army. He should cultivate all the genuine martial virtues. They become Christian virtues when they are cultivated in the fear of God, and with an eye to His glory. The chaplain should not shrink from any emotion which other Christian men in the service may of right cherish or exhibit, on the ground that his calling as a minister forbids him to indulge such a feeling. We would not introduce him into the organization as a foreign element, as simply attached to it. We would guard against intimating, or in any way encouraging the slightest suspicion that he is out of place. We would not do so because we do not have this feeling in the slightest degree, and because any manifestation of it, however indirect, tends to weaken the moral force of the army. It makes the soldier feel, consciously or unconsciously, that his life is inconsistent with at least the higher Christian emotions. It thus makes him either despise the Christian faith or weary of his country's service. We need not stop to show that either feeling will impair his force of character. We complain of Mr. Hammond, not that he says the chaplain is out of place, but that he fails to regard him, and to teach the chaplain to regard himself, as a genuine soldier. We would cultivate this feeling. At least we would not discourage it, and, therefore, we would mark

the chaplain by his dress as a soldier, and an officer, distinguishing him from civilians as clearly as we would any other soldier. At the same time we would designate by his uniform the capacity in which he serves so plainly that he need never be mistaken for any other officer. But we would remind him, and every one else, by his very dress, that he was in the service, that he belonged to the army. We think this would be an advantage to him in his spiritual labors. The men would feel the identity of his interests with theirs. He would not use vain words when he called them fellow-soldiers. Every chaplain, in the field at least, has felt the importance of impressing this feeling upon those to whom he ministers. It is unfortunate for him when they feel that he is one altogether separate and apart from themselves. At the same time we think you sufficiently separate him as an ambassador for God by designating him clearly as the minister of the regiment, and by having no higher grade to which as chaplain he can aspire. There is and can be for him no promotion. The chaplain, so far as the service is concerned, must always remain a chaplain. "We must say to ourselves, I must all my life be doing the same thing without any change—without any extension of my worldly horizon."* Is not this enough to remind us and all men that we are "separated unto the Gospel of God?"

It is altogether in accordance with what seem to be Mr. Hammond's views of the chaplain's place that he fails to say a word of that officer's duty to maintain and enforce the discipline of the army. This is a point of great importance, which has been too much overlooked. The chaplain is not charged directly with the duty of preserving order, but he has much to do with it. All his influence and teachings ought to be on the side of habitual respect for, and implicit obedience to, authority. Neither he nor any one else should ever mistake his position on this point. Whoever else may exhibit a factious, murmuring or turbulent spirit, let the chaplain avoid the least approach to any such temper. No matter how much he preaches and prays, or rather the more he does of these so much the worse, if directly or indirectly he interfere with the maintenance of discipline. It is impossible to calculate the pernicious effect of his failure on

*Vinet's Pastoral Theology, p. 64.

this point. We regard it as a serious defect in a work of so much pretension as the Army Chaplain's Manual, that it does not state distinctly that the chaplain should teach and exhort all soldiers, both officers and men, to show a manly respect for the lawful authority of those who are over them, and to pay prompt obedience to all their lawful commanders. Especially let professing Christians be exhorted to thus adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour, and let the chaplain himself set the example. We have in this Manual a whole chapter upon the qualifications of chaplains, and another as to their "temporal duties," but not a word in either about helping to maintain discipline and good order. Why? Plainly because Mr. Hammond does not regard the chaplain as really *belonging to the army*—as truly a soldier.

Another important duty of a chaplain, especially at the present time, is to inspire our soldiers with confidence in the justice of our cause. He should seek to save them from the depressing feeling that their toil and hardship are a degrading drudgery. The surest way to accomplish this is to teach them that as soldiers they may serve the Lord Christ, and that they are fighting the battles of the Most High. This will make them respect their calling, will give them the highest strength both of endurance and of activity. Nothing can take the place of this feeling, that the Lord is on our side. He who has the slightest misgiving on this point, has no business in the army, certainly not now, as a chaplain. It is not enough for one who serves in this capacity to be satisfied that the nation's cause is just. His sentiments should be sufficiently pronounced to impel him to give utterance to this feeling upon all proper occasions, and in all proper ways. Especially should he labor to impress this truth, as the solace of all their sorrow and the support of all their weakness, upon the minds of all committed to his care. True, it is a part of his divine ministry to restrain and rebuke that savage, cruel temper, into which soldiers are apt to fall. But it is no less his part to cultivate enlightened Christian patriotism, removing men's doubts, and confirming their hopes of the justice and success of our righteous cause. He does not understand his calling if he does not give himself diligently and of set purpose, in season and out of season, to this great work. We regret exceedingly, not to find in the Army Chaplain's Manual, the faintest glow of patriotic ardor. Gustavus Adolphus,

at the battle of Lutzen, looked up to Heaven and cried, "Help, Lord, for we fight in thy cause." Neither in his prayers, nor in his hymns (with perhaps in the case of the latter a single, and that by no means a strong, exception), does Mr. Hammond manifest a similar feeling. The following sentence from the 102d page, so far as we can discern, stands solitary and alone, as the sole recognition of the chaplain's duty, as a soldier and patriot, to his country. "Let him never weary in well doing, both as regards the temporal as well as spiritual happiness of the soldier; for in keeping both of these objects ever before his mind, he is faithful to his trust, and does his duty both to his country and his God." In another place he speaks of the chaplain as preaching to those who have "girded on their armor for the defence of their country." In all the one hundred and forty pages of Mr. Hammond's own writing in this book, these two tame passages are the only approaches to a burst of loyal enthusiasm in the country's cause. We doubt whether any ordinary chaplain from the Potomac to the Mississippi, could write so much and say so little. The chapter on the qualifications of chaplains is long. We will not say it is too long, for we could bear to have it increased by the suggestion that the chaplain should cherish, both in himself and others, a patriotic spirit. At least some of its repetitions to which we have already referred, might have been omitted, and room thus made for the simple statement of this truth. But we would not insist even upon this. The feeling of which we speak might perhaps be best inculcated indirectly, and be more powerful if it ran through the book as a deep under tone. This is the most impressive, because it is the most natural way of manifesting such a feeling. For instance, we took from the writings of another chaplain a passage equivalent to some seven pages of Mr. Hammond's book to see in what spirit it was written, and we found no less than six distinct and emphatic expressions like the following: "Our sacred cause," "our gallant army," "our heroic soldiery." We should have been glad had we found more such expressions in the Army Chaplain's Manual. We are far enough from insinuating that Mr. Hammond doubts the justice of our cause, but he is singularly modest in manifesting his feelings. After the freeness and fullness with which he gives utterance to his Christian sympathies and convictions (all of which we admire), we

should look for him to reveal his patriotic impulses in somewhat due proportion. It must be that in this regard he puts some great restraint upon himself. We think the explanation to this silence is to be found in the fact that Mr. Hammond considers the indulgence, or at least the exhibition of this feeling as not becoming a chaplain. It is all well enough for a soldier, but in his eyes a chaplain is not a soldier. For the same reason, he does not insist, he does not even assert, that the chaplain should seek to cultivate among the men the spirit of earnest, resolute, godly patriotism. It may be said that no considerate chaplain needs to be told that this is a part of his duty. He certainly needs to be told this as much as he does that he must study in order to preach well to soldiers, that it is well for him to have a library, a reading room, and a debating club in a hospital, to frank soldier's letters, to write for the sick, to correspond with their families, &c., &c. All these and similar suggestions are found in this book; they are wise and timely; we are thankful for them. But might not the duty of inspiring men with Christian patriotism find a distinct if not a prominent place in a work designed to supply "a want which has been long felt in the chaplain's department in the army?" The chaplain, if any such there be, who had neglected this part of his work, would have his attention called to it. He who had undertaken it would be encouraged and strengthened for its performance. At least Mr. Hammond might have given us some suggestions from his own experience as to how this duty could be best performed. How instructive, for instance, the following passage from an article to which we have already referred:

"I know of nothing which has so effectually opened the hearts of the men of my Regiment to my efforts to do them good, as little events like the following, which I trust I may be pardoned for briefly alluding to in the way of illustration. On several occasions, when at some of our stations we were momentarily expecting an attack from an overwhelming force said to be close upon us, I have lighted my pipe (for to my shame be it spoken that I have not yet abandoned the unjustifiable practice of smoking) and moved deliberately along the line of battle conversing familiarly with the men, or addressing them in words of cheerfulness and animation. On one occasion, as I remember, after some new recruits who had never met the enemy had been received, the camp was suddenly aroused at midnight and the men called upon to

form immediately for battle in view of an impending attack, and the gallant officer who commanded that portion of the line where the new recruits were stationed, observing that they appeared to be somewhat excited, called my attention to the fact, and requested me to speak with them. I did so, and after addressing them for a few moments found them not only calm and ready, but eager to evince their zeal in their country's hallowed cause."

We will not say that the chaplain will do more good, by such conduct, to the souls of his fellow-soldiers than by all his preaching; but we do not hesitate to express our profound conviction that he can preach no sermon that will not make a deeper impression and be more readily listened to if the men of the command to which he is attached are accustomed to receive, from their intercourse with him, such patriotic and courageous inspiration.

But we may be told that the Army Chaplain's Manual is a grave didactic treatise intended for permanent use in the army, that we are not to expect in it allusions to passing events, much less the popular phrases, the catch-words of the day. But if the book is to be of permanent value it should bear the impress of the times in which it was written, as all substantial contributions to a nation's literature are sure to do. We should prize it more highly hereafter, in quiet hours, if we found upon its pages traces of the tempest that is now sweeping over the land. And if ever this rule holds good it applies with greatly increased force to such a work as this. The book is itself an out-growth of the struggle in which the nation is engaged. It should bear witness to this fact in every fibre of its texture. But for the war it would not have been written, and if written, would certainly have found few readers. It was born of this crisis, if it have any value or significance at all; and if we had written it we should be ashamed to think that it bore no birthmark. We pity the man all of whose thoughts, even his thoughts of God and of Heaven, are not colored with the hue of the sad but glorious days in which we live. We give Mr. Hammond full credit for patriotic and loyal impulses, we are only sorry that he suppressed them.

In accordance with what we suppose to be Mr. Hammond's idea, that the chaplain is not a soldier, he intimates that that

officer should never engage in actual warfare. We have no great opinion of "fighting chaplains," so called; they are likely to be poor preachers and worse warriors. But true to our idea that the chaplain is a genuine soldier, we think exigencies may arise that would justify, nay require, him to take a musket or use a sword. Suppose he found himself among a handful of men, attacked or threatened by an overwhelming force. Is he to say, before any body is shot, my place is with the wounded and the dying? Suppose, as often happens, there are more muskets than men. Shall he let one lie idle, falling back on his professional dignity, and wait until his services in his official capacity are needed? We say, let him get down into a rifle pit, and take his chances with the men, and his preaching will do that much more good when the danger has passed away. We know several chaplains who, by pursuing such a course in some great emergency, have gained a lasting influence which they would have found it all but impossible to acquire in any other way, and which they never could have acquired if in the critical hour they had not acted just as they did. This is one of the ways in which the chaplain is to become all things to all men. True, his ordinary place, especially in a great battle, is with the wounded and the dying. But not any more so certainly than the surgeon's, and both of them, if they have the true feeling of soldiers, as they both ought to have, will sometimes be ready to fight. Certainly they will encourage their fellow-soldiers to fight, and will think it their duty to do so. And if these two, whose place and whose duties on the battle field are so nearly one, should find a broken and defeated column rushing back upon them, may they, or rather *must* they not seek to check the rout? And if, they helping to such a glorious result, the tide should turn, the soldiers rally, and they thus find themselves accidentally at the head of the column, would any one complain of them as out of place? We know that these are extreme cases, but they may occur, and we give them only to show that the chaplain may do, sometimes, what other Christians do regularly, as a part of their lawful calling. If he is never to do anything of the kind it must be because there is something intrinsically wrong in doing such things, and then no Christian may do them. Suppose, again, a chaplain meets a deserter, one whom he knows is a deserter, what shall he do? Give him a

tract, quote Scripture to him, endeavor by "kindness and gentleness" to win him back to his duty? Yes, if in this way he can accomplish that result, though we think he would find that "neither words nor grass" would be of much avail. It is the chaplain's duty, as an officer and a soldier, to bring the deserter back, no matter how, so he does nothing that is wrong. He might well be thankful if he happened to have a revolver with which in the last resort, he could drive the sneaking coward back where he belonged.

Mr. Hammond says, "though swift messengers of death may whistle around" the chaplain "even to endangering his life, he will heed them not if faithful to his duty, but will be totally absorbed in the glorious occupation of whispering in the ears of the departing soul the blessings of redemption." We have never been in battle, and do not know how chaplains feel on such occasions. We suppose that Chaplain Hammond has had some experience, or he would not speak with so much confidence. We hope we shall be thus totally absorbed, if ever we do get into an engagement, though we confess our faith is weak. But seriously, why put the chaplain up upon such stilts, so lofty and we fear unsteady? Give him the benefit of the Latin poets, "*homo sum*." He will feel no doubt very much as the Christian surgeon, the Christian captain and the Christian private do. Let him feel with them the common excitement of the struggle, the common anxiety for success. Cultivate and develop the feeling that makes him one with the whole body of the army. So far as this feeling influences him, it will lead him to devote himself all the more earnestly to the specific duties which belong to his own proper place. Not even the holier and more tender services of his sacred office will form any exception to this rule.

ART. IV.—STUDIES ON THE BIBLE, No. VI. *The First Gospel.**

Soon after our first parents had tasted the forbidden fruit, they were arraigned for trial before the Almighty. They answered separately. The answer of each began with an apology and ended with a confession of guilt. Their apologies were insufficient and shuffling. The man offered a plea which divided the blame of what he had done between his wife and her Creator: "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat." The woman said: "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat;" but she made no excuse for beguiling her husband. The serpent offered no defense; indeed, he was not interrogated. The Almighty then proceeded to pass judgment upon all the parties before him, following the order in which they had severally taken part in the transgression; that is to say: first on the serpent, next on the woman, then on the man.

Now, in the first of these judicial awards, to-wit: in the curse on the tempter, God said: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Gen. 3:15. In these words the Church has always recognized what has been variously styled the First Gospel—the first promise of salvation—the first Messianic Prophecy, or, as it is called in the schools, the Protevangelium.

An inquiry into the structure of the narrative must precede an examination of the First Gospel. Is the Mosaic account of the creation and apostacy of the human race a fable, or is it a myth, or is it a veritable history? And, if a history, is every part of it to be interpreted in a literal sense, or must particular portions be taken as allegorical? As to the essential character of the narrative, the skeptical critics have gone

**Helps to the Study.* Calvin's Comm. on Gen., ch. iii; Fairbairn's Typology, i: 273-280; Hengstenberg's Christology, i: 1-20; Kurtz' Old Cov't., i: 77-88; Turner on Genesis, 183-199; Kitto's Cyclo. *sub voce* Adam; Herzog's Encyc., ib.; McDonald on Penta., ii: 275.

wild in their conclusions. Gabler pronounces the whole history "an absurdity." Eichhorn thinks our first parents brought death upon themselves by eating a poisonous plant. De Wette sees nothing in the fall but a transition from a state of innocence and inactivity to a state of cultivation and degeneracy. Kant and Schelling treat the origin of evil in man's nature as necessary to a complete development of the human being; and they hold the Biblical history of the fall to be a higher species of the fable. The general tendency of this school of criticism, however, is towards the mythical theory. This theory receives the narrative as a collection of legends, well told and well woven together, of the creation of the world, the origin of the human race, its primeval innocence and its fatal degeneracy; the whole colored over by the light of antiquity, and embellished by the creations of the imagination. This myth is, according to some, of Grecian, and, according to others, of Persian origin. The analogies in literature are the story of Romulus and the she wolf, and the chronicles belonging to the legendary period of Egyptian or Grecian history. According to this school of criticism a distinction is to be taken between the "form of the narratives and the ideas which they embody;" and it is the province of the Biblical student to separate, as best he may, the facts of history from the mythology and fiction under which they appear in the Pentateuch, even as the gold hunter culls the grains of gold from the drifts of sand and mud. This theory may be dismissed with three observations. First, if the Mosaic history of the creation and fall be mythical, there is no trustworthy account of these events in existence. So simple and artless is the narrative, so true to nature and reason are its ethical and psychological features, that if this be discarded, what other tradition, written or unwritten, of that early period is worthy of credit? Secondly, the historical value of the subsequent scriptures rests upon the verity of the first three chapters of Genesis. If that book describe a mythical apostacy, then the Gospels unfold a mythical redemption. Straus' conception of Christ is the logical sequent to Von Bohlen's notion of Adam. Thirdly, Christ and his Apostles have made themselves responsible for the strict veracity of

Moses. In what John says of the tree of life, he refers, without doubt, to the tree that stood in the garden of Eden. Rev. ii: 7; xxii: 2, 14. Christ described the tempter when he said: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do, for the devil was a murderer from the beginning." John viii: 44. John also describes him as "the great dragon, that old serpent, called the devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world." Rev. xii: 9; xx: 2. "For," adds Paul, "we are not ignorant of his devices." 2 Cor. ii: 11. Still further, according to Paul, "Adam was first formed, then Eve;" "the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty;" "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression;" "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;" "in Adam all die." 1 Tim. ii: 14; 2 Cor. xi: 3; Rom. v: 12; 1 Cor. xv: 22. These passages exhibit a compendious history of the fall—the tree of life in Eden, the serpent, the devil, his arts of deception, his access to our first parents, the order in which he proceeded—first beguiling Eve, then Adam, the entrance of death into the world, and the ruin brought on the race. Now, if Moses was a retailer of idle legends, what were the apostles? Were they the dupes of Moses, or were the apostles, as well as Moses, willful deceivers?

Those who accept the narrative as strictly historical in its form, are not perfectly agreed in the interpretation of certain parts of it. Some writers teach that the serpent itself was the real and only tempter, and not the instrument used by some other being more intelligent than itself. But this opinion is in conflict with several passages in the New Testament, which recognize the presence of another agent on the occasion. Some, again, maintain that the devil was alone engaged in the temptation, and that whatever is said in Genesis respecting the serpent is figurative or allegorical. This criticism is liable to the exception urged with so much effect by Bishop Horsley upon another point. If the reptile was an allegorical serpent, then the conversation between Eve and the serpent was an allegorical conversation, and the excuse offered by Eve was an allegorical apology. Why not carry out the idea by saying that "Paradise is an allegorical garden, the trees that grew in it, allegorical trees, and the rivers that watered it,

allegorical rivers?" The narrative, in all its particulars, bears the marks of a real history, and it is impossible, without doing violence to the language, to resolve any part of it into either a legend or an allegory. Accordingly the church has always held that the devil was the principal responsible tempter, and the serpent was his instrument. This is undoubtedly the sense of the Scriptures. The active, malignant agent was the devil; a statement which is sustained by the passages cited above from the New Testament, in which the devil is described as that old Serpent who deceiveth the world. Still further, in Rev. xii: 13, may be found a vivid description of the struggles between the dragon, or serpent, and the woman "which brought forth the man-child." The conflict between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent is here clearly recognized, and the fact is stated that the serpent is the devil. But in the seduction of our first parents, he used the reptile as his instrument; a statement which is sustained by the opening words of the narrative: "Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field;" by the terms of the curse: "upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life;" and by the language of Paul, quoted above: "the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty."

From the structure of the narrative, the transition is easy to the form under which its most conspicuous feature, the first Gospel, is revealed. On supposition that God, in his infinite mercy, would provide a way of salvation for the fallen race, and that his goodness would lead him to make it known very early to our first parents, it might be conjectured that he would convey the glad tidings in the form of a promise. Not so, however. He put the first Gospel into the bosom of the curse on the serpent. In its essential character and substance, it is an assurance of redemption to man; in manner and form it is an integral part of the sentence passed on his seducer. It took this form from the nature of the proceeding then pending. That proceeding was strictly retributive. God was engaged in the administration of divine justice upon the parties to the great transgression. Addressing the reptile, which had been employed as the instrument and organ of the tempta-

tion, God said: "thou art cursed above all cattle and above every beast of the field." Then addressing Satan, who was the real tempter, God said: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." So strictly judicial, so stern and strenuous was the occasion, that its proprieties put upon even the word of salvation, the force and frown of a divine malediction on the enemy of souls!

It is to be observed, still further, that the contents of the First Gospel materially affected the judgments afterward pronounced separately on the woman and the man. What God said to the serpent, announced that the reign of grace was begun; what God said to our first parents, corresponded precisely to that gracious assurance; and his words to each of the three parties before him were in perfect harmony. This harmony appears, for example in the fact pointed out, as long ago as the third century, by Tertullian, that no curse was pronounced on either Eve or Adam. Only to the serpent God said: "Thou art cursed." God condemned the woman to multiplied sorrows and perpetual subjection, but he pronounced no curse upon her person. God condemned the man to sorrow and toil all the days of his life; he cursed the ground for man's sake, but not the man himself. Satan only was accursed, not the victims of his subtilty.

This unity of purpose appears, further, in the intimation conveyed to each of the parties, to the effect that the lives of our first parents should be spared for a season. The original threat was: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." When the guilty pair stood before their awful Judge, they had reason to fear the infliction of instant death. But when God said to the tempter: "I will put enmity between thy seed and her seed," they were warranted to infer that their lives would be spared until at least they should see the promised seed. This respite entered also into the judgment pronounced on each of them individually. To the woman God said: "In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children"—but then she should live to bring them forth; to the man God said: "In sorrow shalt thou eat of the ground"—but then he should live to enjoy the fruits of his toil. It was, however, a

respite, not a final pardon, for God instantly added: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Adam joyfully recognized his escape from immediate death. At the formation of his wife, he called her Woman—"because she was taken out of man;" but now he gave her a new name, Eve—"because she was the mother of all living." But how is this respite to be reconciled with the terms of the threat? The words were: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" the respite actually granted to Adam was nine hundred years. The answer to this inquiry is to be found in the complex nature of the death which was threatened. This form of punishment is three-fold: the corruption of our whole nature, which is spiritual death; the separation of the soul from the body, which is temporal death; and the destruction of both soul and body in hell, which is eternal death. Now, spiritual death instantly followed the eating of the forbidden fruit, and therein the original threat was executed to the letter; the human body, also, became mortal and began to die, and therein the sanction was substantially enforced; while the infliction of eternal death was, by divine mercy, altogether withheld for a season.

The further notion of a probation for the human race was not obscurely conveyed by all these proceedings. The curse which was pronounced on Satan was, as has been remarked, withheld from our first parents. The sorrows of subjection and child-bearing laid upon the woman, the sorrows of ceaseless toil laid upon the man, do not, in strictness of speech, make up the entire curse of God upon the sinner; these are not the elements of the second death. The Almighty pronounced on the unhappy offenders, not the final sentence of the law, but, as Dr. R. J. Breckinridge has well defined it, "an interlocutory sentence, extending from the fall to the final judgment." Satan was left to perish in hell, without hope of escape or redemption; but as to the human race, the sentence of eternal death was adjourned over to another day; meanwhile a period of probation was granted, a saviour was promised, and the hope of salvation was set before them.

In the language of popular theology, the human race is said to lie under the curse of a violated law. But it is worthy of

consideration whether this is an exact statement of the case, and whether it would not contribute to a thorough exposition of the narrative of the temptation and fall, to accept as true, the remark of Tertullian quoted above. The penalty of the law in its first element, which is spiritual death, has been both pronounced and inflicted on every man. That penalty, in its second element, which is temporal death, has been pronounced but not fully inflicted on the living. The same penalty in its third and bitterest ingredient, which is eternal death, has been neither pronounced in form nor inflicted on any man now alive. This last is the very curse of the law, and the word of the Lord uttering it upon even the wicked, is reserved unto the great day. As to the righteous portion of the race, it will be forever true that, in this strictest and most terrific sense of the term, they were never accursed of God; and as to the wicked, it will be forever true that, so long as they lived, they were not under the curse, but their probation was complete. Not until the resurrection of the dead, will the execration that fell on the devil in the beginning visit those who serve him. "Then shall he also say unto them on his left hand, Depart from me *ye cursed* into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Matt. xxv: 41. The seed of the serpent will then, for the first time, share in the malediction originally inflicted on the devil, and go away to the place originally prepared for him and his angels. A similar line of thought terminates in the conclusion that the Son of God was not, by virtue of his relation to our first parents, brought under the curse of the law; even as by virtue of his supernatural generation he escaped the contagion of original sin. He was undoubtedly under the curse, but, let it be observed, he "was *made* a curse for us." Gal. iii: 13. That is to say, the curse of the law, which he bore in our behalf, did not inevitably attach itself to his person through his participation in human nature, but was laid upon him by a special ordinance of God, in the form of imputation, when he undertook to make satisfaction to the divine law.

But what was the import of the First Gospel? This is, by far, the most important topic within the range of this inquiry and ought to be well considered. By the terms of the Gospel

in the first place, Satan is condemned to a state of supreme debasement and contempt. "Thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." The effect of this sentence upon the reptile and its effect upon the real tempter, should be separately described. Many commentators, both Jewish and Christian, have held that the serpent suffered a thorough physical and organic degradation under the anger of God. He was originally furnished with wings; he was provided with legs; he was a flying seraph, according to the use of the Hebrew word *nahghash*, in Numb. xxi: 6; "he did not go upon his belly, but moved upon the hinder part of his body, with his head, and breast, and belly upright;" "he did go with his breast erect as the basalisk at this day doth;"—these are some of the conjectures which may be found in the books. Milton, who touches nothing that he does not adorn, writes that the serpent approached Eve:

"not with indented wave,
 Prone on the ground as since; but on his rear,
 Circular base of rising folds, that towered
 Fold above fold, a surging maze! his head
 Crested aloft, and carbuncle his eyes;
 With burnished neck of verdant gold, erect
 Amidst his circling spires, that on the grass
 Floated redundant; pleasing was his shape
 And lovely."

If Maimonides has character enough to bear out the statement, an old Jewish gloss teaches, that "the serpent was an animal as large as a camel, that it might be ridden on, and that Sammael, which is another name for Satan, rode on it when Eve was deceived." These suggestions go far beyond the record. They involve not merely a loss of wings or legs to the serpent, but a supernatural change in its anatomical structure. No such change is directly indicated in the Scriptures; it is not established by any good and necessary conclusion from their general tenor; nor is it forced upon the student by the absence of a better explanation of the facts. Such an explanation is proposed by Calvin, to the effect that the serpent was originally created to go

upon his belly and eat dust; that it was now simply remanded to its former prostrate condition; and this condition became by Divine appointment, and in the unalterable conception of the human mind, a token of perpetual infamy. This opinion proceeds upon the laws which control the association of ideas. A striking analogy is to be recognized in the shame which overtook the human pair at the apostasy. While they stood in innocency they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed. So soon as they had sinned their nakedness became associated with the consciousness of guilt, and they were overwhelmed with shame. This sentiment has in human nature the force of an instinct. While the naked condition of the domestic animals does not offend the modesty of the most refined, the nakedness of the human body shocks the sensibilities of the rudest. In later ages, the cross was at first not only the instrument of torture, but the emblem of infamy; yet, afterward, it became the symbol of transcendant honor and glory. These changing phenomena of thought and sensibility are wholly subjective. What Milton calls "the first naked glory" of the human body was not changed to vileness in Paradise; nor was the cross transformed into an object of consummate symmetry at Calvary; but these both, like the prostrate condition of the serpent, became unalterably associated with sentiments of shame or honor. So much for the effect of the curse upon the reptile. Its effect upon the actual tempter, the devil, was to subject him to everlasting shame, abhorrence and contempt. He had used the serpent as his tool, and now in the condition of the animal, Satan should recognize his own position in the scale of being. Even as the serpent is more abject and disgusting than any beast of the field which the Lord God has made, so Satan is the basest and most despicable member of the whole rational creation.

Secondly, the First Gospel contains an absolute, but indefinite promise of salvation. It has pleased God to unfold, gradually, through long ages, the plan of redemption. The promise now under examination is the earliest of a series of revelations which become, as they proceed, more definite and precise. The ultimate victory of the kingdom of light over the kingdom of darkness is predicted in the First Gospel, and the assurance is added that this victory shall be won by the seed of the woman. But who are the seed of the woman? The

expression bears a three-fold meaning. It may signify the whole human family, for Eve is the mother of all living. It describes more definitely the righteous portion of the race: "The good seed are the children of the kingdom." Matt. xiii: 38. In its most exalted sense it is predicated of Christ, who was no less the SEED of the woman than of Abraham. Gal., iii: 16. Now, the First Gospel puts no precise definition on the expression; it does not state whether the victory shall be won by the human race, considered as a whole, or by a particular and gifted portion of it only, or by one adorable Person. Nor does it designate the time when the great conqueror shall appear, to bruise Satan under his feet. The region of the earth, and the race in the midst of which this redemption shall be wrought out, are not fore-shown. The modern believer, looking at the subject from his own point of view, interprets the promise as of one, even Christ, and of the body whereof he is the head, even the church. This great truth was, if one may so say, infolded in the promise, but was not unfolded by it. The whole economy of salvation was there potentially, as the tree with its trunk and spreading branches is potentially in the germ, together with its many annual crowns of foliage, and its wealth of flowers and fruits oft-repeated and redundant. Accordingly the best modern interpreters receive the promise in its most general signification. "Even according to this interpretation," says Hengstenberg, "the passage justly bears the name of the *Proterangelium*, which has been given to it by the church. It is only in general terms, indeed, that the future victory of the kingdom of light over the kingdom of darkness is foretold, and not the person of the Redeemer who should lead in the warfare, and bestow the strength which should be necessary for maintaining it. But anything beyond this we are not entitled to expect at the first beginnings of the human race. A gradual progress is observable in the kingdom of grace as well as in that of nature." Calvin gives more prominence to the Messianic idea, and so reaches a sounder interpretation. "I explain, therefore, the *Seed* to mean the posterity of the woman in general. But since experience teaches us that not all the sons of Adam, by far,

arise as conquerors of the devil, we must necessarily come to one head, that we may find to whom the victory belongs. So Paul from the seed of Abraham leads us to Christ; because many were degenerate sons, and a considerable part adulterous through infidelity, whence it follows that the unity of the body flows from the head. Wherefore, the sense will be, in my judgment, that the human race, which Satan was endeavoring to oppress, would at length be victorious."

Thirdly, redemption was promised not only to the first man and woman, but to their posterity likewise. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman"—an assurance, in its primal sense, personal to the woman: "and between thy seed and her seed, it [her seed] shall bruise thy head"—an assurance unto her posterity. It is to be observed that the grammatical forms used here, to-wit, *seed* and *it*, point to the unity of the human race; for he said not *seeds*, as of many, but her *seed*, as of one. The sin of the first parents had ruined the race descending from them by ordinary generation. Their children, when born, would find themselves exiles from Paradise, destitute of the divine image and the divine favor, subject to sorrow and toil, and to the dissolution of the body, and liable to death eternal. Now, by the terms of the First Gospel, a victory over the tempter was promised to the race. The inseparable relation of Adam to his posterity in vital and important elements of this transgression, its punishment, and the promised deliverance, is here most distinctly asserted; indeed, the doctrine of headship is a point more squarely put than almost any other part of the case. The student of the Bible may, without further debate, accept the conclusion that if he would comprehend the true sense of the Scriptures, he must take with him the principle that God's promises to the representative men of the race, such as Adam, Noah, Abraham, David, are promises as well to their seed after them. The human family is not made up of separate and independent beings, like a rope of sand, but is held together in unity by a common nature, by descent from one and the same stock, and by the tenor of the divine covenants and promises. What has been sometimes called a "federal theology," roots itself in the very constitution of the human being in the essential and

primordial principles of the First Gospel, in the covenant of works which was revealed before that gospel, and in the covenant of grace which was first made manifest therein.

Fourthly, God put perpetual enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. Instead of the friendliness and fellowship which had existed between the parties at the forbidden tree, there should be an unceasing antipathy and conflict. This prediction has received one form of fulfilment in the relations which have existed between the righteous and the wicked portions of the race. That the righteous are the seed of the woman appears from the words of Christ quoted above: "The good seed are the children of the kingdom." Matt. xiii: 38. The wicked are denominated by the same authority the seed of the serpent, the children of the devil. Said Christ to the blasphemous Jews: "Ye are of your father, the devil." "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers." John, viii: 44; Matt. xxiii: 33; xiii: 38. The hostility of the wicked towards the righteous began in the murder of Abel; it appeared again in the successful attempt of the posterity of Cain to debauch the posterity of Seth by the marriage of "the sons of God," the Sethites, with "the daughters of men," the Cainites. Gen. vi: 2. It reappeared in the indecency of Ham; in the hatred of Esau towards Jacob; in the outrages inflicted by the Egyptians upon the Israelites; in the attack of the Amalekites upon the exhausted rear of the Hebrews in the wilderness (Deut. xxv: 17, 18); and in the long and dreary wars waged for a thousand years upon Israel by all the heathen tribes dwelling between the Euphrates and the Nile. This enmity has been perpetuated ever since. Persecution has in all ages worn out the saints of the Most High God, and the meek but courageous disciples of the Lord have to this day resisted unto blood, striving against sin. But it has been a contest of skill as well as a violent onset. The devices which the adversary employed in Paradise to seduce our first parents did not exhaust his subtilty. He has inspired his seed on earth with the spirit, and armed them with all the weapons of his far-seeing malignity; so that the seed of the woman must stand not only against the merciless assaults but against the wiles also of the devil.

But this conflict was carried into a higher sphere. One of the most luminous points of view which is presented in Gospel history brings under inspection the antagonism between the Son of God and the Adversary. Christ came to destroy the works of the devil, and his incarnation gave a decisive turn to the long war between the "seed of the woman" and the "seed of the serpent." Christ understood this to be one main part of his mission, for he said: "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out." John, xii: 31; Compare, xiv: 30; xvi: 11. By the incarnation, the heads of the two opposing kingdoms came into personal collision. This struggle colored the whole course of the life of Jesus. It began early, even at the very threshold of his mortal career. Doubtless at the instigation of the devil it was that Herod sought the young child's life. The Adversary renewed the assault at the beginning of Christ's public ministry; immediately after his baptism, Jesus was in "the wilderness forty days, tempted of Satan." Here the parties met face to face. The devil recognized the person of Christ, for he said: "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." Christ recognized the presence and person of the tempter, saying: "Get thee behind me, Satan." The malignant enemy retired, but only for the time being. The Son of God instantly exchanged the terrors of starvation in the wilderness and the solicitations of the adversary for the society and ministry of angels; yet, as Luke significantly remarks: "When the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him *for a season*." The foul fiend approached him, again, in the persons of the Pharisees, even as he had seduced the woman under the form of a reptile. Christ was at no loss to trace their malice to its infernal origin. He said to them: "Ye are of your father, the devil; and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning." John, viii: 44. And because the Pharisees had encouraged the devil to identify them with the serpent in the garden, allowing him to put them to the same base uses, Christ pointed out both the dishonor and damnation into which they were plunging: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Matt. xxiii: 33. Still

further, the devil, if he did not arrange, certainly entered personally into the conspiracy to put Christ to death. John traces his agency in the plot step by step. Nearly a year before the crucifixion Jesus said to his disciples: "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon; for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve." Before the last supper the devil had "now put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him," and, at the supper, "when Jesus had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, and after the sop, Satan entered into him." John, vi: 70, 71; xiii: 2, 27. The supreme crisis in the struggle occurred during the passion. As he entered into it Christ exclaimed to his enemies: "This is your hour, and the power of darkness."—Luke, xxii: 53. The sufferings of Christ were infinitely mysterious, and the Evangelists treat them with a reserve which ought to be sacredly respected. But it may be fairly inferred from their statements that at this turning point in the affairs of heaven and earth, the "powers of darkness," knowing that their "hour" was come, marshaled all their forces, in hideous array, they fell upon their victim with indescribable fury, and mingled horrid ingredients in the cup of bitterness which he prayed might pass away from him.

This direct and personal collision between the Prince of Peace and the Prince of the Power of the Air, explains certain peculiarities in the four gospels. The frequency of demoniacal possessions in the time of Christ, the importance attached by the Evangelists to the miracles by which the devils were cast out, the minuteness with which both the symptoms and supernatural cure of the malady are described, and the careful record that is made of the words spoken by Christ and by the unclean spirits, are phenomena peculiar to the Gospel history. Such possessions occurred very rarely in the Old Testament period; they ceased almost entirely at the death of Christ, and have in modern times, as is commonly supposed, wholly disappeared. All this is explained by the fact that the life of Christ was the critical period in the conflict between the two seeds announced in the First Gospel. To the end that his Son might utterly destroy the works of the devil, God was

pleased to loose the adversary for a little season and so bring on the final struggle. Hence, the astonishing multiplication at that time, of demoniacal possessions and the frightful power which they exercised over the souls and bodies of their victims, are to be referred to the divine appointment. The space assigned to this class of miracles in the gospels, enabled the Evangelists to show that Christ was always, without fear or failure, the conqueror of Satan. The repeated instances in which the Son of God rebuked the unclean spirits by name, and in which the unclean spirits addressed the Son of God by name, show that the parties were met face to face, and that in the person of Jesus the Adversary recognized the Son of God, and the Son of God in his turn detected the presence of the Adversary in the madness and convulsions of the victims. And, once more, the refusal of Christ to receive the testimony of the foul spirits to his Messiahship—for “he suffered them not to speak, *because they knew him*,”—shows that he came not to be witnessed unto by the Adversary, but to subdue him, to put him to shame, and to bruise him under his feet. Mark, i: 34; iii: 12. Luke, iv: 41. The whole course of this part of sacred history is a thorough commentary on the First Gospel. It explains also the joy of the seventy disciples and the remark of the Master: “And the seventy returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name. And he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.” Luke, x: 17, 18.

Fifthly, in this conflict, the seed of the woman shall suffer much, but shall finally triumph. “It (the seed of the woman) shall bruise thy *head* and thou shalt bruise his *heel*.” A comparison is presented between a vital organ, the head, and an organ remote from the seat of vitality, the heel; a crushed head, which is a mortal wound, contrasts a bruised heel, which is a curable wound. The heel of the woman shall be injured, it shall suffer much, perhaps intensely; the head itself of the serpent shall be bruised, and so the serpent get his death-blow. It can not be doubted that the righteous portion of the human family, who are, in the widest sense, the seed of the woman, are a suffering people; neither will it be doubted, by those who accept as true, the revelation, and promises of the divine

word, that they shall finally triumph. "As it is written, for thy sake we are killed all the day long, we are counted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us." "And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." Rom. viii: 36, 37; xvi: 20. The application of this promise to the person of Christ will appear in the sequel.

Sixthly, the First Gospel is to be received as a Messianic prophecy. Its intimations are that the Saviour shall be a man, and yet more than a man, that he shall be, in a most peculiar sense, the seed of the woman, and that he shall be at once a suffering and a triumphant Redeemer. He shall be a man, the seed of the woman; a partaker of her flesh and blood; a true man, therefore, having a human body and a reasonable soul. But, again, he shall be more than a man. He who had destroyed our first parents was greater than they, and could not, in his turn be overcome, except by one who is greater still. Now he who shall finally put in subjection the conqueror of man, must be supreme, not only over the conquered race, but the conquering adversary. The prophecy points out, therefore, not obscurely, the superhuman, if not the divine character of the coming One. Next it is intimated that the Messiah shall be the seed of the woman severally, not of the man and woman jointly. "*Her* seed shall bruise thy head." The inscrutable idea of the "seed of the woman," as in some way distinct from that of the man, would not probably be recognized among the contents of the First Gospel, except in the light shed upon it by subsequent revelations. The word of Jehovah through Isaiah to king Ahaz, contained a restatement of the mystery, in plainer terms: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." Is. vii, 14. Even this prophecy was susceptible of another interpretation. But when the fullness of time was come, and God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, then was divulged the mystery that lay hidden in those old prophecies respecting the seed of the woman and the child born of a virgin mother. The Creed expresses the truth in one of its aspects: "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the virgin Mary;" Archbishop Usher in another: "As man he was without a father, as God without a mother." Once more, the First Gospel reveals a truth which is a primal doctrine in the final

gospel, also, that the Redeemer should be a suffering and a triumphant Messiah. He should receive a bruise in the heel but he should bruise the head of the adversary. Christ was a suffering Messiah. Otherwise he could not save his people. He must be tempted of the devil, persecuted with incessant and masterly enmity by the serpent's seed, betrayed by one into whom Satan should enter with that very intent, and finally be put to death by a conspiracy, in which evil men were the instruments and the devil the living soul. Yet, after all, it was by the suffering of death that he triumphed over him that had the power of death, even the devil. Here was unfolded the inmost sense of the bruised head and bruised heel of the First Gospel. The path of the conqueror led through the ignominy of the cross and the gloom of the sepulcher, to his crown and kingdom. He led captivity captive, and spoiled principalities and powers, making a show of them openly. He seized the kings of the earth that set themselves and the rulers that took council against him, and broke them with a rod of iron, and dashed them in pieces like a potter's vessel. And to complete his triumph, "He laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years and cast him into the bottomless pit." Rev. xx: 2, 3. Ps. ii: 9.

Seventhly, the established connection between the salvation of the righteous and the destruction of the wicked is set forth in the First Gospel. Nothing short of a deadly wound, inflicted upon the serpent, even a bruised head, can give the victory to the seed of the woman. This is no ingenious deduction of the theologians from the terms of the First Gospel, but it is a settled principle, clothed with the force almost of a law, in the Divine administration. Not only was the drowning of the old world associated, in point of fact and time, with the rescue of Noah, but the instrument of punishment for the wicked was the means of escape for the righteous. The flood that destroyed the ungodly, bore Noah and his family safely upon its bosom. These were saved not *from* but "*by* water," "the like figure whereunto even baptism doth now save us." 1 Pet. iii: 21. The escape of righteous Lot from Sodom was instantly followed by the rain of brimstone and fire upon the cities of the plain. The emancipation of the Hebrews from bondage in Egypt, was effected by a series of

desolating plagues upon their enemies; the departure of Israel, God's first born Son, was closely joined with the death of the first born of the heathen; and at the Red Sea the double process of the salvation of the people of God and the destruction of his enemies was made complete. The final settlement of the promised seed in the promised land, involved the extermination of the foul and filthy inhabitants of Canaan. A thousand years afterwards the release of the Jews from captivity in Babylon, was brought about by the capture of the city and the slaughter of the impious Belshazzar. In the reign of Darius, Daniel was taken unhurt out of the den of lions, and his accusers were instantly cast upon their hungry jaws. The work of Christ also proceeded on this principle. He came to destroy and to save. The prophet Isaiah declared that the Messiah would publish not salvation alone but salvation linked in with perdition: "He shall come to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, *and* the day of vengeance of our God." Is. lxi: 2. John the Baptist resumed the strain: "He will gather the wheat into the garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Matt. iii: 12. Nor did the Son of man, when he came, fail to assert the principle in its broadest application. In the parable of the tares and the wheat it is written: "In the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn." Matt. xiii: 30. In the fall of Jerusalem, the few believers who were in the city, being warned of God, escaped from the impending catastrophe, while the scoffing multitudes, who remained, perished in the horrors of the siege. Traces of this double process appear in the work of the Holy Spirit upon the hearts of believers. There is a slaying and a making alive: "Our old man is crucified with Christ;" "and they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts;"—that is the slaying. "You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins;"—that is the making alive. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord;"—there is the whole work in both its parts; the seed of the serpent is extirpated and a holy seed is implanted in the heart. On the day

of judgment the salvation of the righteous and the destruction of the wicked will walk hand in hand together throughout the whole company of the risen dead. To some Christ will say, Come ye blessed, to others, Depart ye cursed. The eternal song will begin, and at the same moment the eternal wail. The people that are in heaven will say Alleluia, and on the instant the smoke of Babylon will begin to ascend. Rev. xix: 1-4. Comp. Matt. xiii: 41-43.

Such are the leading features of the first gospel. This survey of them, however, suggests an inquiry to which some attention ought to be paid. To what extent did Adam and his immediate posterity apprehend the contents of this revelation? They did not stand in the light cast upon it by the subsequent revelations, especially those of the New Testament; what conceptions had they of the promised Seed? In reply, it may be said, that the modern believer is not in a condition to estimate, accurately, the sum of saving knowledge possessed by those who dwelt among the shadows of the old dispensation. One of the apartments, in the Capitol of modern Rome, contains several master-pieces of antique sculpture; among them is the Dying Gladiator, and the celebrated statues of Zeno and Antinous. Let it be supposed that several parties visit this room at different times: one in the early gray of the morning, another on a misty day, and a third under a perfect artist's light. Let it be supposed, further, that the last named visitors have received the most vivid impression of the noble bust of Zeno, that they have nearly fainted in sympathy with the reeling marble of the gladiator; what just conceptions could they form of the impressions made by those wonderful compositions upon persons who had seen them only in the twilight or under a gloomy morning? In like manner, it is not possible for the Christian student, by any mere mental process, to determine the precise amount of knowledge deduced by our first parents from the terms of the First Gospel. Much that is plain to him may have been hidden from them. As a further reply, evidence might be produced showing that our first parents were enabled, by faith, to apprehend the general tenor of evangelical truths and promises. The name given by Adam to his wife, the names given by Eve to her three sons,

Cain, Abel and Seth, are received by many sound critics as exponents of a true faith in the great salvation. From the use which they made of skins for clothing, it is fair to infer that they instituted the bloody sacrifice, as an act of worship, immediately after they had received the promise. To these remote indications of saving knowledge, in that early day, it to be added the fact that God made many important revelations to the antediluvian believers, which are not recorded in the Pentateuch. Respecting the departure from this life of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, it is said: "he was not, for God took him." For aught that appears in this exposition, God may have taken Enoch by death, as he took Adam; and for aught that further appears, neither Enoch nor his contemporaries had information of a future state or a general judgment. But towards the close of the New Testament, Paul states that Enoch was translated; an act of God which was in itself a revelation of another life and of the redemption of the body; and Jude preserves the substance of one of Enoch's prophecies, whereby both the fact and the character of the general judgment were plainly divulged to the men of his generation. (Jude, 15.) To what extent these primeval revelations proceeded, in what measure the saving truths now preached to all the world out of the New Testament were made known to these early friends of God, are questions which can not be determined. The student of the Bible should be careful not to conclude too much from the silence of Scripture; else, as an old Scotch divine was fond of saying, one might be tempted to affirm that Joab had no father, forasmuch as the name of Zeruah only, his mother, is recorded.

If the contents of the First Gospel have been truly exhibited, in the preceding pages, it is evident that this remarkable revelation presents the exact point of view from which the tenor of all the subsequent revelations ought to be surveyed. It is the genesis of the whole plan of salvation, not only as its beginning in the order of time, but as its germinal principle in the way of development; the foundation on which rest, both historically and doctrinally, all the other scriptures and the entire economy of redemption. It holds a direct relation, for example, to the

other Messianic promises. No fewer than seven of these promises were given between the fall of Adam and the reign of David. The First Gospel introduces the series. Afterwards, Noah, speaking by inspiration, said: "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem." "He [the Christ] shall dwell in the tents of Shem." Gen. ix: 26, 27. To Abraham God said: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Gen. xxii: 18. The dying Jacob prophesied: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." Gen. xlix: 10. Balaam spake, saying: "There shall come a star out of Jacob and a scepter shall rise out of Israel."—Numb., xxiv: 17. The word of God to Moses was: "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee." Deut. xviii: 18. Said Nathan to David: "Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever." 2 Sam. vii: 12-16. This catena of Messianic promises exhibits several note-worthy characteristics. First, they were made, with a single exception, to representative men, in distinct recognition of the principle of headship so often asserted in the Scriptures. Adam was the progenitor of the race and its federal head; Noah its second father and a contracting party to one of the divine covenants; Abraham the father of the faithful and a contracting party to another and greater covenant; Jacob the patriarch of the promised seed expatriated, for a season, from the promised land; Moses was the leader and commander of the people; and David was the founder of the royal line of Judah. Next, these promises served to mark the great epochs of sacred history—the fall, the flood, the call of Abraham, the descent into Egypt, the close of the wandering of Israel in the wilderness, and the reign of the first theocratic king. Each of these points of time is a stage in the progress of events and is illuminated by a distinct promise of the Messiah. Again, four of the prophecies were uttered in the most gloomy periods of the patriarchial history; and so became lights shining in dark places. The apostacy of our first parents plunged the race into an estate of sin and misery apparently remediless; but a remedy was immediately made known in the terms of the First Gospel. Another apostacy all but total occurred; the race, eight souls excepted, was destroyed by the flood; but Noah, standing almost

alone amidst the ruins of the old world, was inspired to utter a new Messianic prophecy. Then afterwards, two of those groups of nations, Japheth and Ham, forgot God in their dispersions; and soon Shem, which was the line of promise, established idolatry on the banks of the Euphrates. Josh. xxiv: 2. God once more interposed, appointed Abraham to found the visible church, and gave to him the third promise of a Saviour. About two hundred years later, when the people of God were exiles in the land of Egypt and were about to experience hard and bitter bondage from the heathen, God opened the lips of Jacob to utter, in the word Shiloh, the name of the Prince of Peace. The last three of the seven promises were published in brighter days. Moses spoke of a Prophet like unto himself, and Balaam saw his star and his scepter, just before Israel crossed the Jordan; and the promise was communicated to David at the most brilliant period of his reign. Lastly, these several promises increase in fullness and clearness as the series proceeds. The First Gospel gave a general assurance of victory to the seed of the woman, and added nothing more. Noah revealed the fact that this deliverance should appear in the Shemitic race. God's word to Abraham was to the effect that the salvation should spring up in the bosom of his seed and flow thence unto all nations. Jacob made known, for the first time, that this redemption should come in the person of One, even Shiloh, rather than through the labors of some holy and favored people working or suffering together upon the problem. Moses foretold his divine wisdom as a prophet. Balaam foretold his majesty as a king, for he saw a star come out of Jacob and a scepter rise out of Israel. Finally, God confirmed to Nathan, the prophet, the vision of Balaam, and added the intimation that the future king should come in the lineage of David and should sit upon the throne of that monarch as king in Zion. Meanwhile the office of Christ as high priest had been set forth typically, in the person of Aaron and in his services at the altar. The substance of the seven written and the one typical prophecies taken together is a victorious Redeemer coming in the line of Shem and of the seed of Abraham; Saviour of all nations; one Saviour, not many; a prophet like unto Moses; a king of the royal line of David, and a priest like unto Aaron. All these truths were expanded and expounded in the written and spoken

predictions which were uttered during the reign of David and after his death : and these make up the complete Christology of the Old Testament.

The right interpretation of the First Gospel leads directly to the right interpretation of the genealogies of Scripture. These registers are very numerous and extensive ; not less than one hundred may be counted in both Testaments. From the large spaces assigned to them, and from the uses to which they are put, it is certain that the sacred writers attached great importance to these parts of the record. It may be well, therefore, to gather up, with patience, the rays of light cast upon them by the First Gospel.

These tables may be distributed into several classes. The first and most important class begins with our first parents and proceeds, with unbroken continuity, to the birth of Christ. Abstracts of these registers are incorporated into the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Matthew, writing for the Jews, traces his lineage back to Abraham, for salvation was of the Jews, and the promise to Abraham was, "In thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Gen. xxii : 18. Luke, writing for the Gentiles, continues the genealogy to Adam, showing that Christ was the seed of the very woman to whom the first promise was made. The two Evangelists trace his ancestry through different lines as far as David, upon whom both unite, showing how the Lord God gave unto Jesus, as he had promised, the throne of his father David. Luke, i : 32. The same tables show the process by which the side branches of the line of promise were successively broken off through the period of forty centuries. Adam begat sons and daughters ; yet they all and their posterity, are excluded from the register of Christ's genealogy, Seth only being retained. From the children of Seth the table adopts Enos only, and from the sons and daughters of Enos, Cainan ; and so onward to Noah, the main stem is preserved, while all the collateral branches are left in oblivion. In Noah's family, Shem obtains a place in the favored line, while Japheth and Ham, with the multitudinous peoples that sprang from their loins, go away into far countries, like the younger son in the parable. From the children of Shem, Arphaxad only is

taken, his other sons and daughters are left. The same rule, taking one and leaving many, is enforced on the five following generations down to Nahor. Out of all his offspring, Abraham is selected. Abraham had three wives and as many families of children, but the sons of Hagar and Keturah are all set aside, and in Isaac his seed is called. Next, Jacob is chosen and Esau is rejected. Jacob's twelve sons are jointly accepted as the seed of promise; but it soon appears that the lineage of Christ falls into the tribe of Judah; in the after ages, the single family of Jesse is segregated from all the families of that powerful tribe; out of Jesse's many sons, David is taken, and out of all the sons of David, Solomon and Nathan alone. Thence onward, for a thousand years, the genealogies of Christ make sure their separate way through the tumultuous mass of humanity, like currents in the midst of the sea, until at last they converge upon Joseph and Mary. The registers are not more instructive in the names they contain than in the names they reject. The principle of a divine selection everywhere appears, and a scheme of unbroken descent, from Adam to Christ, is wrought out, which has no parallel in history.

The genealogies of the second class establish the fact that all mankind descended from one man and one woman. This truth is fundamental to the scheme of revealed religion; it points out the indissoluble connection between the lost estate of all mankind and the disobedience of their common progenitor, and it demonstrates that the seed of the woman is the Saviour of the entire race, because he partook in the flesh and blood of every family and every member thereof. Accordingly, in the history of the antediluvian period, both the line of Seth, which was the line of promise, and the line of Cain, which was the line of the serpent's seed, are brought down in the tables, to the days of Noah, in order to show that both lines sprang from Adam the first father, and were recapitulated in Noah, the second father of the race, and consequently all that were in the ark, even if the blood of Cain ran in their veins, were of one and only one, original stock. The tenth chapter of Genesis, the most valuable and comprehensive ethnographical chart in existence, sets forth the dis-

persion of the nations and their distribution over the earth. Then the genealogies of the Old Testament, taking their departure from that remarkable document, bring down, through several generations, the pedigrees of those by "whom the nations were divided in the earth after the flood." Gen. x: 32. These registers complete the historical proof of the unity in origin of the entire race. It is not improbable that Paul spake not only by the Spirit of inspiration, but out of a thorough study of these tables, when he expounded the subject both to the Greeks and the Romans, the representatives of the two pagan civilizations in Europe. To the Greeks he said: "God hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Acts, xvii: 26. In his epistle to the Romans, he demonstrated, on the basis of this fact, the ruin of the race in the first Adam and its recovery in the second Adam, the Lord from Heaven.

A third series of these registers traces the process by which certain branches which were broken off from the line of promise, were, after the lapse of many generations, grafted again into the lineage of the Saviour. Lot, for example, was an offshoot of the Abrahamic stock, and his posterity, Moab and Ammon, were aliens from the holy covenants. But the pedigrees of these races show that Lot's remote posterity, through both its branches, returned into the line of the promised Messiah. Boaz, a direct descendant of Abraham, married Ruth, a daughter of Moab; and the mother of Rehoboam was Naamah, an Ammonitess. Ruth, iv: 17-22. 2 Chron. xii: 13. In like manner, it appears from the tables that Tamar and Rahab, both Canaanitish women, were on the one hand, through Ham, the daughters of Noah, and on the other, by marriage respectively with Judah and Salmon, ancestresses of Christ; like some of the bayous of the river Mississippi, which leave the channel and flow apart through many a league, traversing cypress swamps and gloomy forests, and then draw near and return again to the parent stream. Even Matthew, although writing for the Jews, introduces into his register the names of three of these heathen women, as if to give all possible publicity to the fact that the blood of

the older Gentiles had found its way into the veins of the Seed of the woman.

Yet another set of these tables elucidates that part of the First Gospel which describes the enmity put between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. Cain, in the family of Adam, and through the antediluvian period, Cain's posterity, represented the serpent's seed. The murder of Abel, and the corruption of all flesh through the evil example of the Cainites, fulfilled the parable of the bruised heel; the total extermination of the Cainites as a race by the flood fulfilled the parable of the bruised head. Ham represented, in Noah's family, the serpent's seed, and the genealogies, in the tenth chapter of Genesis, trace his progeny down to the kings and people of Egypt and to the kings and people of Babylon, who in their generations oppressed the people of God and then ignominiously perished. Ishmael, in Abraham's household, and Esau, in Isaac's household, occupied the same hostile position towards the seed of promise. According to the registers, Ishmael who mocked Isaac gave existence to many of the Bedouin tribes which infested the Southern border of Palestine. But what is more remarkable, Esau's line is distinctly traceable first to the Amalekites, who through all their generations cherished an inextinguishable hatred towards the Israelites, and then down to Herod the king, who in his day "sought the young child's life." How completely the prophecy of the bruised heel and the bruised head was fulfilled in the crimes and penal sufferings of the Amalekites and of the Herods is well known to the reader of the Scriptures.

Now the relevancy of these genealogies to the First Gospel indicates, in part, their real value, as integral portions of the inspired records. Critics there are, who are shallow enough to thrust them aside as mere rubbish. Too many of the devout readers of the holy word consider them wearisome and uninteresting. Some who profess to be students of the Bible, deal with the first nine chapters of the Chronicles, very much as some who profess to be students of Homer, deal with the last four hundred lines of the second Iliad: they deliberately "skip" page after page. The church is, in a large measure, responsible for this state of things. Rarely, indeed, if ever, are these portions of Scripture expounded or even read in the house of God by the ministers of churches which have no liturgy; and even

the church of England excludes, for the most part, the genealogies of the Old Testament from its admirable "Table of Lessons of Holy Scripture." This general neglect of the subject ought to prevail no longer. These genealogies are profitable for instruction. When well considered, they open fresh and attractive fields of inquiry; they reveal unexpected side-lights and pleasing surprises; and solve not a few difficult problems in sacred history.

ART. V.—*The New Life of the Redeemed.*—PART II.

THE fundamental conception of true religion, the religion of the Bible, is a new life. Christianity has its doctrine, its moral law, and its perfect exemplification of that law; but in its inner nature, it is neither a system of doctrine, nor a rule of moral conduct, nor an example of perfect moral excellence. It is a life in Christ and with Christ, who is the sum and substance of doctrine, duty, and example. He is himself the way, and the truth, and the life; and the life which springs from union with him, is the holiness of truth,—the doctrine of Christ actualized in the intellectual and emotional nature of the believer; and its spontaneous actings can not be otherwise than conformable to the rule of rectitude and the perfect example of Christ. "My little children," says the apostle Paul, "of whom I travail in birth again, until Christ be formed in you." It is Christ within, informing the soul of man, and Christ exhibited outwardly in the daily walk and conversation; all completely realized only in the resurrection estate, when this mortal shall have put on immortality in the world of glory. Here the new life is imperfect: step by step the soul advances to that lofty goal which is reached only when it is reunited to its own body, in the morning of the great day of Jesus Christ. That body, though now mouldering in the grave, is still united to Christ. At his omnific word it shall come forth from the dust of the tomb, and, in virtue of its union to him, be made like unto his glorious

body. Now, "we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory;" then, in our entire humanity, "when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is."

The *mystical union* lies at the foundation of enlarged and Scriptural views of the new life, and possesses, therefore, a central significance in this discussion. It is decisive of the nature of that life, and holds a most important relation to the fundamental doctrines of salvation. Yet (for what reason it is unnecessary now to inquire particularly), the mystical union has well nigh lost its place in the theology of the church, whatever may be true of the schools. Much, indeed, is heard from the pulpit of the union of believers to Christ; but for aught that appears to the contrary, nothing more may be implied than a spiritual sympathy of the soul with Christ, or, which is probably more commonly intended, a covenant relation to him as our federal head. The insufficiency of the statements touching this important truth, may arise from the practical and objective cast of our popular religion and theology. The subjective and contemplative aspect, so characteristic of the religion of a former age, has been obliterated by the attrition of the tumultuous world outside. The mysteriousness, too, of the subject may repel investigation, or induce a certain degree of hesitancy in speaking of it. Mystery, however, enshrouds the doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, in a word, all the distinctive doctrines of salvation. But, whatever may be the reason, it is certainly the fact that the pulpit is generally silent on the mystical union; and, as a necessary consequence, it is either dying out of the faith of the church, or the conception of it is bald and inadequate to the last degree. Nevertheless, it is of the very heart of evangelical religion and theology; and it is well to remember that no surer method to develop rationalistic modes of thought in the popular mind could be adopted, than for the pulpit either to be silent, or to give a feeble and hesitating utterance, on the peculiar themes of the Christian revelation. "The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." The policy of the leading Unitarians of Massachusetts, in the beginning of the present century, was a

specimen of this worldly wisdom. Ignore the substantive doctrines of the Gospel, and the belief of them will soon fade away. A negative theology is the bane of the church and the world. The positive annunciation of the testimony of God concerning his Son Jesus Christ, is the capital idea of preaching.

In presenting a statement of the doctrine of the Mystical Union, so far at least as the nature of the case admits, it will be most satisfactory to give it in the words of approved divines, and those of our own day and country. The statement will thereby gain authority, and at the same time avoid the suspicion of being framed to serve a purpose. Moreover, the charge of mysticism will not lie against them. For whatever may be true of men of other ages and countries, it will not be alleged that the divines of our own church here quoted, are infected with the spirit of the mystical philosophy. Our first quotation is from Dr. Breckinridge's *Second Part of Theology, Subjective*, p. 114:

The union of this whole body, (*i. e.* the invisible Church), and of every member of it, with the *person* of Christ, is a mystical union, that is a real and spiritual one; and the manner of its occurrence is also mystical, but yet real and spiritual; so that the body itself, and its union with Christ, and the manner in which that union is effected, are all of one and the same nature. There is nothing metaphorical in the case, much less anything imaginary: neither is there anything physical or corporal. But nevertheless it is real, regard being had to the things united: for while the Apostle admits it to be a great mystery, he asserts the fact that our nature, soul and body, are united to the soul and body of Christ, for we are declared to be members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones: nay, in a certain sense, the church is the very body of Christ, and each saint a particular member of that body: and they are all made partakers of the divine nature.

On page 205 is an intimation, by no means obscure, of the transcendent nature of the new life in and with Christ the Mediator;

God himself is most holy; and the restoration of man to the lost image of his Creator—and the predestinated conformity of the elect to the image of the Son of God—can mean no less, *how much soever more they may mean*—than their recovery, not only of the knowledge, but of

the righteousness and true holiness of creatures having the image and likeness of God, and conformity to the image of his Son.

In the Princeton Review for the year 1848, vol. xx, is an elaborate and very instructive review of Dr. J. W. Nevin's work on the Mystical Presence. It is violating no propriety to say it is attributed, and correctly, as we suppose, to Dr. Hodge. The extracts here given, necessarily longer than could be desired, are taken from pages 228-9 and 266-7. There will be occasion to refer again to this article.

"But the Scriptures teach that our union with Christ is far more than this;" *i. e.* far more than one merely moral, arising from agreement and sympathy. "It is a *vital* union; we are partakers of his life, for it is not we that live, but Christ that liveth in us. It is said to be *analogous to our union with Adam*, to the union between the head and members of the same body, and between the vine and its branches. There are some points in reference to this subject, with regard to which almost all Christians are agreed. They agree that this union includes a federal or representative relation, arising from a divine constitution; and on the part of Christ, a participation of our nature. He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one. On this account he calls them brethren. Inasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same. (Heb. ii: 11-14). It is in virtue of his assumption of our nature that he stands to us in the intimate relation here spoken of. It is agreed, further, that this union includes on our part a participation of the Spirit of Christ. It is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ, and dwells without measure in him as our head, who dwells also in his people, so that they become one body in Christ Jesus. They are one in relation to each other, and one in relation to him. As the human body is one by being pervaded and animated by one soul, so Christ and his people are one in virtue of the indwelling of one and the same Spirit, the Holy Ghost. It is further agreed that this union relates to the bodies as well as the souls of believers. Know ye not, says the apostle, that your bodies are the members of Christ; know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, who dwelleth in you? The Westminster Catechism, therefore, says of believers after death, that their bodies, being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves until the resurrection. This union was always represented as a real union, not merely imaginary, nor simply moral, nor arising from the mere reception of the benefits which Christ has procured. We receive Christ himself, and are in

Christ, united to him by the indwelling of his Spirit and by a living faith. So far all the Reformed at least agreed. Pp. 228-9.

According to the Reformed church that union is not merely moral, nor is it merely legal or federal, nor does it arise simply from Christ having assumed our nature; it is at the same time real and vital. But the bond of that union, however intimate or extensive, is *the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, the third person of the Godhead, in Christ and in his people*. We receive Christ himself, when we receive the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ; *we receive the life of Christ when we receive his Spirit, who is the Spirit of life*. Such we believe to be the true doctrine of the Reformed church on this subject. Pp. 266-7.*

In the Westminster standards, the definition of this union is found in the answer to the sixty-sixth question of the Larger Catechism: "The union which the elect have with Christ is the work of God's grace, whereby they are spiritually and mystically, yet really and inseparably, joined to Christ as their head and husband; which is done in their effectual calling."

Several points in these summaries need to be distinctly noted. (1). The mystical union is *real*; not metaphorical, much less imaginary; not merely *moral*, nor merely *legal* or *federal*. (2). It is *spiritual*; not physical or corporal, yet it relates to the bodies as well as the souls of believers. Their bodies share in the benefits of it. They are temples of the Holy Ghost.

(3). It is *vital*: we are partakers of the life of Christ. *It is analogous to our union with Adam*. And as the mystical union is declared to be not merely legal or federal, the analogy here has respect to Adam as our natural head, from whom we descend by ordinary generation, and thereby become partakers of the same corrupt human life with him after his fall. So, in virtue of our union with Christ, not merely federal, but vital also, we are made partakers of his life. We are his seed.†

* The authors are not responsible for the Italics in these quotations.

† In commenting on 1 Cor. vi: 17, *But he that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit*, Dr. Hodge remarks, "That is, has one Spirit with him. This does not mean has the same disposition or state of mind, but the same principle of life, the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is given without measure unto Christ, and from him is communicated to all his people, who are thereby brought into a common life with him."

If he is simply a perfect man, then we derive from him simply a perfect human life; but if he be very God as well as very man, then we derive from him a divine as well as a renewed human life. In Adam we all die—are under the dominion of death, though living souls. In Christ we are made alive; the dominion of death is removed. And not only so; but grace abounds. It does not stop with discharging the penalty of the violated Covenant of Works. The nature and method of the remedy forbid that it should. There is an abounding fulness and efficacy and glory in the grace of Him whose name is Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace. By means of the remedy which grace provides and applies, “not only is the restoration of man to be made complete, but he will be exalted far beyond what he could have attained, if he had never fallen.” (Breckinridge’s First Part of Theology, p. 486.) This exaltation consists in the communication of the divine in the second Adam, to whom the believer is actually and inseparably joined in his effectual calling, having been in him from everlasting as a party in interest to the Covenant of Redemption.

The profoundest naturalists divide all organized bodies into three great classes, called kingdoms; viz., vegetable, animal, human. Each has its own peculiar life, and in addition, embraces the life or lives of all beneath it. To the first belong the functions comprehended under nutrition and reproduction; to the second, sensibility and the power of motion, added to the preceding functions; to the third, and in addition to what belongs to both the other classes, a higher and wider range of intellect, conscience, and articulate language. Were we obliged to specify some one grand differentia of the third class, it would be conscience—the perception of right and wrong, and the feeling of moral obligation. The *λογος ενδείκτετος* and the *λογος προφορικος* *ratio* and *oratio* (of which, too, there are indications in the inferior classes), sink far below the *συνείδησις* both in dignity and characterization. Designating each class by its peculiar life, we predicate of the first vegetable life; of the second, animal; of the third, moral. “The plant lives; the animal lives and feels; man lives and feels and thinks.” This is the order of things in the natural world; this the progression in the ascending

scale of life; this the order in time of the original creation. First comes the plant, then the animal, then man. Upon vegetable is superinduced animal life, and upon both these the moral life of man. Now, in the regeneration, in the new and spiritual creation, there is another advance—a culminating manifestation of creative wonders. Upon all the kinds of life enumerated above, is superinduced a fourth, to-wit, the divine life. Man mounts upward to the skies; nay, he ascends above the skies into the heaven of heavens. In this sublime ascent he leaves the angels far behind. Joined in an ineffable and inseparable union to the Son of God, he enters into the holiest of all, whither also Jesus the forerunner hath gone. In this lofty rise, however, man sloughs off whatever of the inferior kinds of life may be incongruous to his higher functions and new relations. He enters upon the full realization and fruition of the great salvation, with a sublimated animal life and a spiritual body.

(4.) A fourth point, and one deserving special attention, is the relation of the Holy Spirit to the mystical union. “The bond of that union is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead, in Christ and in his people. We receive Christ himself, when we receive the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ; we receive the life of Christ, when we receive his Spirit, who is the Spirit of life.” There is something, then, far other than simply an influence of the Holy Ghost upon the soul of man, disposing and enabling it to receive, embrace, and love the truth of God, thereby bringing it into communion and sympathy with Christ and all holy creatures. There is something, too, more than a merely sustaining power of the Spirit, watching as a faithful guardian round about the soul, averting evil, inciting to good, and upholding it in its integrity. All this is true, but is not all the truth. There is an actual indwelling of the Holy Ghost, the third person of the glorious and blessed Trinity. Let the import of this statement be carefully considered. There is not a divine influence merely; not merely a power exerted *ab extra*; but a real, personal indwelling of the Holy Ghost. He takes up his abode with the redeemed. The Spirit, given without measure to the Redeemer of God’s elect, is also their heritage. “The Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove” upon the Saviour at his baptism, and “abode upon him.” Thus was he anointed and inaugurated for his mediatorial work.

Here the life of the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, in its active official sense, begins. And the Spirit that descended and abode upon him, comes upon and abides with his people. They also receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost. It is this common indwelling of the Holy Ghost, the third person of the Godhead, that makes the Saviour and his people one. Herein the household of God is distinguished from all other intelligences in the universe, and lifted high above them. The indwelling of the Spirit of God can be predicated of no other beings. It is not true of angels; it was not true of man in his primeval state. It is the peculiar prerogative of redeemed men—their crowning glory and unfailing security. Whatever may be the work or influence of the Holy Ghost touching other rational creatures, he *dwells* in none other than these. Let it be observed, moreover, that the unity constituted by the common indwelling of the Holy Ghost, is a unity of life between Christ and his saints. “We receive the life of Christ when we receive his Spirit, who is the Spirit of life.”

The life-union of the second Adam and his spiritual seed, is further confirmed and illustrated by the nature and design of the Lord's supper. One chief end of this sacrament is to exhibit and confirm the union of believers with their adorable head. And it seems impossible for human language or earthly symbols to exhibit the intimate nature of that union more clearly or more emphatically.

The active and even acrimonious discussions between leading divines of the Lutheran and Reformed communions, at the Reformation period, form a most interesting chapter of ecclesiastical history. Subordinate differences of opinion prevailed among the Reformed themselves; and the object of the article in the Princeton Review, from which quotations have been made above, is to educe the true doctrine of the Reformed Church from the writings of her most distinguished theologians and the confessions of her faith. Those discussions turned upon the nature of Christ's presence in the sacrament, and the manner in which his body and blood become effectual to believers. But there was a remarkable unanimity respecting the great truth exhibited, and the effect of truly receiving the body and blood of the Lord: and

this is all that concerns the present argument. The following brief statements from some of the symbolical books of the Reformed and the writings of him who is *facile princeps*, and which are found prepared to our hand in the article just named, comprise what is sufficient for this occasion:

“*What is the effect of receiving the body and blood of Christ?* In general terms it is answered by saying, that union with Christ, and the consequent reception of his benefits, is the effect of the believing reception of the Lord’s supper. In the Basel confession, it is said, ‘So that we, as members of his body, as our true head, live in him and he in us.’ The Geneva Catechism says the effect is ‘That we coalesce with him in the same life.’ The Scotch Confession says, ‘We surely believe that he abides in them (believers) and they in him, so that they become flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones.’ The Heidelberg catechism has much the same words, adding, ‘and ever live and are governed by one Spirit, as the members of our body by one soul.’ The Second Helv. Confession says, the effect of the Lord’s supper is such an application of the purchase of Christ’s death, by the Holy Spirit, ‘that he lives in us and we in him.’ So the Aug. Confession and others.” (Princeton Review, 1848, p. 254.)

On page 240 of the same volume, are found the following question and answer from the Heidelberg catechism:

“*What is it then to eat the crucified body and drink the shed blood of Christ?* It is not only to embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ, and thereby to obtain the pardon of sin and eternal life; but also, besides that, to become more and more united to his sacred body, by the Holy Ghost who dwells both in Christ and in us; so that we, though Christ is in heaven and we on earth, are notwithstanding, flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones; and that we live are governed forever by one Spirit, as members of the same body are by one soul.”

On pages 233–4 are the following extracts from Calvin:

“Now this sacred communication of his flesh and blood, by which Christ transfuses his life into us, just as if he penetrated our bones and marrow, he testifies and seals in the holy supper; not by the exhibition of a vain and empty sign, but by putting forth such an energy of his Spirit as fulfils what he promises. What is thus attested he offers to all who approach the spiritual banquet. It is, however, fruitfully received

by believers only, who accept such vast grace with inward gratitude and trust. * * * * In the sacred supper we acknowledge it a miracle, transcending both nature and our own understanding, that Christ's life is made common to us with himself, and his flesh given us as aliment."

On pages 236-7 occurs this passage:

"In the Scotch Con. of 1560, the language of Calvin is in a great measure retained. The only sentence that need be quoted is the following: 'We confess that believers in the right use of the Lord's supper thus eat the body and drink the blood of Jesus Christ, and we firmly believe that he dwells in them, and they in him; nay, that they thus become flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones. For as the eternal deity gives life and immortality to the flesh of Christ, so also his flesh and blood, when eaten and drunk by us, confer on us the same prerogatives.'"

The distinguished writer subsequently sums up (pp. 255-6) the sense in which the Reformed church teaches that believers are flesh of Christ's flesh and bone of his bones, on this wise:

If it be asked, however, in what sense that church teaches that we are flesh of Christ's flesh, and bone of his bones? the answer is, in the same sense which Paul says the same thing. And his meaning is very plain. He tells us that a husband should love his wife as his own body. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. His wife is himself; for the Scriptures say, they are one flesh. All this, he adds, is true of Christ and his people. He loves the church as himself. She is his bride; flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones. If the intimate relationship, the identification of feelings, affections, and interests, between a man and his wife, if their spiritual union, justifies the assertion that they are one flesh, far more may the same thing be said of the spiritual relation between Christ and his people, which is much more intimate, sublime, and mysterious, arising, as it does, from the inhabitation of one and the same Spirit, and producing not only a union of feeling and affection, but of life.

These testimonies are too perspicuous to be misunderstood; and they all conduce to one and the same conclusion. The life of Christ, the God-man, our Mediator, is our life; not the life of the Redeemer's human nature, nor of his divine, but that of the entire Christ, both God and man. It is the life of him who has two distinct natures though but one person. The inhabitation of the Holy Ghost, the third person of the

Godhead, is that which produces and ever upholds this life, by communicating and applying to us the body and blood of Christ. We are members of his body, flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones. We live by one and the same Spirit, dwelling in him and us, and are governed thereby as the members of the same body by one soul. The union of life between Christ and his people is much more intimate, sublime, and mysterious, than any analogue existing among earthly relationships. The union of husband and wife is but a shadow of it. The head and members of the same natural body are not more really actuated by the same vital force, than the mystical body of which Christ is the head. The vine and its branches partake not more really of the same life-principle than do Christ and his people; constitute one organized whole not more really than they.

Yet, intimate and real as this life-union is, it involves no fusion of Christ's personality with the persons of his people. Adam and all his posterity descending from him by ordinary generation, make up one race, one organic body. All sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression. They are partakers of the same corrupt nature with him; yet he and each one of his race are distinct personalities. So it is affirmed of Christ and those who, being in him, receive from him the spiritual regeneration. He and they are of one life; yet he and each of them retain their proper individuality.

But so far is the testimony of the Scriptures on this subject from being exhausted by what has already been adduced, that the most remarkable class of texts remains to be considered. As with the Redeemer's love for his people, so with this ineffable union and oneness of life between him and them. When Jehovah's love for his saints is said to exceed even the love of a woman for the fruit of her womb, the climax of all human and terrestrial analogies is reached, and even that found inadequate. Nay, the whole creation of God, celestial as well as terrestrial, fails to supply a similitude competent to illustrate the length and breadth, and depth and height, of the love of Christ which passeth knowledge. We must pass beyond the bounds of earth and time, and rise high above the most august of created beings, to gain the object of our search. We must

enter the innermost sanctuary of Divinity itself. There, *there* alone, in the boundless affection subsisting from all eternity between the almighty Father and his co-equal and co-eternal Son, is found the sufficient analogue of the divine Redeemer's love for his people: "*As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you!*" (John, xv: 9). What a word is this! How transcendantly wonderful! Language is exhausted; thought is overpowered. All a poor sinner can do, is to lie low in the dust and weep. Now, in like manner do the Scriptures represent our union with Christ and the new life thereby. The human body, marriage, the vine and its branches, are symbols of it, but only symbols. They but dimly shadow forth the truth. The truth itself is so awfully sublime and mysterious, so transcends all human or angelic relationships, as to be the counterpart to nothing less than the inscrutable mystery of the inbeing of the Father and the Son. We are transported again from earth to heaven; from the created to the uncreated; from the level of human experience, of the seen and temporal, up to the high throne of Deity. The intercommunion and mutual indwelling of the persons of the Godhead, are set before us as the measure of the intimate union and oneness of life subsisting between Christ and the redeemed: "*As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.*" John, v: 26. "*As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.*" John, vi: 57 and 56. "*If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him.*" John, x: 37 and 38. "*Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.*" John, xiv: 10. "*At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and you in me and I in you.*" John, xiv: 20. "*If a man love me he will keep my words; and my father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him.*" John, xiv: 23. "*Neither pray I for these alone; but for them also which shall believe*

on me through their word; that they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me." John, xvii: 20-23. "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Gal. ii: 20. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" 1 Cor. iii: 16. "In whom (Jesus Christ) all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit." Eph. ii: 21 and 22. "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." 1 John, iv: 15.

As we listen to these utterances, many of them direct from the mouth of the incarnate Saviour, our minds shrink from the vain endeavor to penetrate the deep profound of their meaning. Of the limitation of our faculties, of the impotency of human thought, we become painfully conscious as we try to frame ideas responsive to the language of inspiration: Who can appropriate the thought of God as revealed in terms like these? Who is not appalled at the awful height of being destined to the believing sinner? When we turn aside to see this great sight, like Moses before the bush in Horeb, we hide our faces. And yet, who is not impelled to meditate on these things? and as all scripture is profitable, doubtless there is profit for us in these Scriptures, however partial and glimmering the views we can catch of their truths. The statement of the propositions themselves, their relations and connections, however difficult the exposition, will interest and instruct. The order, too, in which these texts are arranged, will facilitate the end in view:

(1). The Son as Mediator, sent of the Father, hath life in himself, even as the Father who sent him. This hath been *given* him of the Father. It is a prerogative of the Son in the economy of redemption. It lies in the very nature of his mediatorial work that he should have life in himself; that he should

be the foundation of life, himself the principle of life, and so quicken whom he will. The *living* Father hath sent the Son, and the Son lives *on account of* the Father: (*ὁὐὰ* with the accusative. See Winer, Sect. xlix, c). The Son lives because the Father lives, and can no more die than the living Father who is the *ground* of his life. He hath life in himself. So he that eateth the Son, that eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood, that truly appropriates him, even *he* shall live *on account of* him. He shall live because the Son lives, and can no more die than he. By receiving the living bread which came down from heaven, he hath eternal life. By partaking of the Son, there is communicated to him that life which the Son through the Father hath in himself.

(2). The communion of life between the Father and the Son, and between the Son and those who partake of him, the living bread, is expressed under the same formulas. In both cases it is an inbeing, an indwelling. This, moreover, is the method whereby the life is communicated and maintained. The Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father; the Father dwelleth in the Son, and the Son in the Father. So of the Son and them who partake of his flesh and blood. He is in them, and they in him; he dwelleth in them, and they in him. Nay more; the Father and the Son make their abode with them, and they are one in them. The Son is in the Father, they are in the Son, and the Son is in them. God dwelleth in them, and they in God.

(3). Every person of the Godhead is said to dwell in the children of God. As the Father and the Son, so also the Spirit. The testimony is explicit: "The Spirit of God dwelleth in you." They, too, are "in the Spirit."

(4). The Holy Ghost is the *causa medians* of this reciprocal inbeing and indwelling. He is the bond of Union and communion. It is the Holy Ghost, who proceedeth from both, whereby the Father and the Son reciprocally dwell in each other:* and the eternal consciousness of the unity subsisting between the three persons in the one divine essence, is to be ascribed to the inbeing of the third in the first and second persons of the Godhead, and his eternal procession from them. So also in regard of the life of God in the souls of redeemed men. Christ

* See Dr. Breckinridge's First Part of Theology, p. 240.

liveth in them: the Holy Ghost dwelleth in them: they are an habitation of God through the spirit. "He that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit." The third person of the Godhead, therefore, dwelling in Christ and in his people, is the bond of union between them, whereby they reciprocally dwell in each other, even as the Father and the Son. So also of the consciousness that we are in Christ, and one in him and the Father. "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by (in) the Holy Ghost:" therefore, he that believeth on Jesus, hath the witness in himself that Jesus is the Son of God, even the testimony of the Holy Ghost who dwelleth in him, and also beareth witness with his spirit that he is a child of God. Again, he that hath the Holy Ghost dwelling in him hath life; and he that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath the Son hath the Father also. Whatever, then, be the exact nature of the unity established between the believing soul and the persons of the Godhead, through the mediation of the Son of God, the Holy Ghost is the proximate producing cause and bond of it, and also of the consciousness of it. But this consciousness exists in the soul while here on earth in different degrees, varying from the faintest and most evanescent feeling of its reality, to an assurance more or less permanent. In the world of glory, its perfect and permanent realization will be experienced.

Of the unity between the Father, the Son, and believers, Luther, as quoted by Tholuck,* discourses thus: "Thou and I, he (the Son addressing the Father) would say, are one, in one divine essence and majesty; after the same example they shall also be one among one another, and that, too, in such wise, that this same unity shall be one in us, that is, be incorporated in me and thee; in brief, that they all be one, and one only, in us both; yea, so completely 'one bread,' that they have all that thou and I are able to have: consequently he prays that *we also may become partakers of the divine nature*, as St. Peter says, 2 Peter, i, 4; for although the Father and Christ are one in another way, a way more sublime and incomprehensible, in virtue of the divine essence, yet we so possess all this that it is ours and is enjoyed by us."

It is well known that from the days of Origen and Chrysos-

* Commentary on the Gospel of John, translated by C. P. Krauth, D. D., p. 373.

tom to the present time, a division of opinion has prevailed touching the relation of the latter part of the sixth chapter of John's gospel to the Lord's supper. Some deny any reference *at all* to that sacrament, and understand the eating of Christ's flesh and the drinking of his blood to mean simply a partaking of the spiritual power of the Redeemer; others affirm that the discourse relates *primarily* to the Supper, and that the mention of it before its institution is, as it were, a prediction of it by Christ. Up to the time of the Reformation, the latter was the view commonly accepted. In the discussions between the Lutherans and the Reformed, the Lutheran divines maintained the latter view; the Reformed, the former: at least this is true as a general statement. The reason of it is to be found, no doubt, in the great influence exerted upon an expositor by his previously settled convictions, and the general circle of ideas in which his mind moves. And in seasons of heated controversy, each idol of the mind sways its leaden scepter with unwonted energy. Differences of opinion on the nature of the Lord's supper, in some aspects of it, and the tenet of Consubstantiation, affirmed on the one hand and denied on the other, biased the judgment of interpreters. There can, however, hardly be reasonable doubt that there is in the sixth of John *some* reference to the supper. For, while the discourse on the bread of life in the latter part of the chapter, naturally follows and grows out of the miraculous feeding of the five thousand and the incidents succeeding it, recorded in the former part, the peculiar turn of thought and expression must have received their impress from the sacrament the Saviour had determined to institute before his passion. The similarity is too manifest and striking to be fortuitous. That the reference was latent in the mind of the Great Teacher, is no evidence against its reality. The necessary failure of his hearers to apprehend it, is but one out of many instances where his teaching could be fairly comprehended only in the light of subsequent events. As the completed volume of inspiration embraces a complete system of truth whose parts mutually illustrate each other, so the minor subdivisions of those parts reflect light one upon the other. The support of natural life in the miracle, by the production and distribution of the meat that perisheth, lays the foundation for instruction and exhortation about the meat which endureth unto everlasting life.

That meat is the flesh and blood of the Son of God. The profound truth thus enunciated is embodied in the sacrament of the Supper, for the perpetual edification of the body of Christ; and this discourse is an inspired commentary, proleptically given, on the nature and design of that sacrament. Underlying all is the subtile relation or correspondence between things natural and things spiritual; and though we can not define what life is, this discourse links together the life that now is and its support through the meat that perisheth, and the eternal life of the renewed man through the flesh and blood of the Son of God, given to us in the sacrament under the symbols of bread and wine. The words of the Saviour in John, vi: 53, 55, and those at the institution of the supper—"This is my body, This is my blood,"—imply a unity of thought and subject that ought not to be mistaken; and the sacrament and the inspired commentary together constitute an irrefragable proof of the oneness of Christ and his people. They are a spiritual organism of which he is the head and his people the members. One life-blood, so to speak, flows through the veins of the whole. The humanity of the one is completely penetrated by the divine life of the other, who is himself also human as well as divine. They are one race as really as Adam and his posterity; and they are so because they are of one blood, and consequently of one life. "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth" (Acts, xvii: 26); and the blood is the life. See Gen. ix: 4. Very pertinent here are the remarks of Dr. Hodge in his Commentary on Ephesians:* "To partake of one's flesh and blood, does not, in ordinary life, nor according to Scripture usage, mean to partake of his substance, but it does mean to partake of his life. * * * * Nothing is more common than to speak of the blood of a father flowing in the veins of his descendants, and of their being his flesh. This means, and can only mean, that they are partakers of his life. * * * * As, therefore, participation of one's flesh does not, in other connections, mean participation of his substance, it can not be fairly understood in that sense when spoken of our relation to Christ. And as in all analogous cases it does express derivation or community of life, it must be so understood here."

*See pp. 345-6. The entire comment on Chap. v: 30, pp. 337, 47, deserves a careful reading.

In this connection, we refer also to Dr. Breckinridge's Second Part of Theology, Book V, ch. xxx; particularly II.--5, pp. 605-7.

The mystical union, then, between Christ and his people, exhibited in the Lord's Supper and confirmed thereby to all true believers, involves a oneness of life between him and them. This life exists in Christ the Mediator as its original source—the Father having given to him to have life in himself. It is derived from him by elect sinners of our race, when they are united to him in their effectual calling, and born again. They are his spiritual seed. They constitute with him, their head, one race, even as Adam and his posterity; who are of one blood, and therefore of one life, and therefore one race. The community of life between Christ and his seed, is grounded in the common indwelling of the Holy Ghost, the third person of the Godhead. The mystical union is a great mystery, far exceeding our finite comprehension. It may be stated in a form of words; it may be illustrated, as it is in the Scriptures, by symbols expressive of the most intimate unions that obtain in this world, but it can not be fully explained. Nay, it is illustrated in the Scriptures, as has been shown, in the most amazing manner; but it is a mystery still. That very illustration, while it is the strongest proof possible of the ineffable intimate nature of the union, overawes the mind, and bids us know how abortive must be all attempts to penetrate the arcana of a divine life, the life of God in the soul of man. No man knows what any form of life is; much less can he know what that life is which flows from the incarnate God into redeemed humanity. Furthermore, believers being in Christ and he in them; he in the Father, and the Father in him, and both dwelling in believers; and the Holy Ghost, whereby the Father and the Son reciprocally dwell in each other, also dwelling in them,—such a relation is established thereby between believers and the Godhead, that they become “the household of God.” God is their Father in a sense infinitely peculiar and transcendently glorious; *their* Father as he is of no other finite being in the universe. Of all else he is Father by creation; of these, by begetting. To the wonderful analogies heretofore adduced, this other one must be added. Christ is the eternally begotten Son of the Father, and to as many as receive him—receive him into their hearts, so that he dwells and lives there—gives he power (authority, pre-

rogative) to become the sons of God. They pass beyond the order of the created into that of the begotten. In this, as in all things else, they are made like unto him. Their new and peculiar relation to the Godhead corresponds to their new life. The one infers the other. And further, their new and peculiar relation to the Godhead carries with it as a necessary result, the acquisition of a glory, majesty, and blessedness, altogether beyond the range of human thought. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God," says the apostle John, "and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him;" and says Paul, "If children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ." Now, if these things be so, who can hesitate to acknowledge that redeemed men in their glorified state, when the life of Christ is perfected in them, are advanced to a position in the scale of being immeasurably higher than that of the angels of God?

Before leaving the manifold evidences to the truth of the views presented and maintained in this essay, two passages of Holy Scripture require at least a brief though a distinct notice. One of them has been quoted, perhaps, several times. Both point to a condition of the human soul so far removed from the ordinary conception of its destiny, that one might well hesitate to attempt an exposition of them. Indeed, they can not be expounded at all, upon any low rationalistic theory of interpretation. The first is,

2 Pet. i: 4. "Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises, that by these ye might be (become) partakers of the divine nature (*γέννησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως*); having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust." No countenance, it may be remarked, is given in this text to the pantheistic notion that all things are now God, or a part of God. The end of the promises is that we *may become* partakers of the divine nature. But there are two mistakes—one on the one side, the other on the other—which demand careful attention. The first is, that our human nature will be transmuted into the divine essence, or absorbed in the divine nature, so that we shall lose our individuality and self-consciousness. It is impossible, in the nature of the case, that the created should become the uncreated and eternal; and it is contrary to the whole current of Scriptural truth, that the separate existence

of the redeemed should be absorbed and lost in the infinite being of God. Whatever is to be the condition of man hereafter, it is certain he will be man still. He is ever to have a distinct, individual existence as man. He will never lose his personal identity. On the other hand, to interpret the text so as to make its whole meaning consist simply in a participation of the moral perfections of God, that is, that man shall become perfectly free from sin, and think and feel and act in entire accord with the will of God, is absolutely to destroy the force of language; for the expression, "that ye may become partakers of the divine nature," is as precise as it is extraordinary and cogent. This is no participation of the divine nature at all. It is neither more nor less than the latent spirit of rationalism working in us, which induces us, most unwisely and most injuriously, to the interests of true godliness, thus to temper down the most august utterances of the divine word. If "to become a partaker of the divine nature" is nothing more than the restoration of man to his primeval integrity, though in another sphere of being and activity, then indeed is language a nose of wax, to be twisted at will, and the accurate communication of thought an impossibility. Least of all will it be possible to communicate to man the high thoughts and purposes of God. When the limited experience of three-score years and ten, or of a score of generations, and human reason and power in their highest development, are made the measure of every thing, legends and myths and allegories and blank denials become the natural and ready engines of wholesale destructiveness, and even when these are abjured, the grandest mysteries of the Christian faith may be obscured, or may fail to be apprehended at all, by reason of a covert unwillingness to accept the thought language gives. To resolve the expression under consideration into a synonym to perfect moral excellence, implies a principle of criticism as really destructive of the integrity of the divine word as myths and allegories. Avoiding, then, extremes on the one hand and the other, and allowing to language its just force, what meaning ought to be attached to the phrase "to become partakers of the divine nature?" So far is it from implying an absorption of the human in the divine, that it fairly implies that the human is the principal subject of discourse and the divine something which it shares in with another; just as

when Christ is said to have partaken of flesh and blood, the mind reverts to his divine nature as the principal subject, and conceives of human nature as something joined to that. And the Incarnation is the very illustration which the Scriptures supply, whereby we can obtain some suitable conception of the glorious destiny appointed to the redeemed of earth. Christ brought down the divine nature into union with the human, that he might lift up the latter and bring it into union with the divine. In the Incarnation there is no absorption of the one nature by the other; no blending of the one with the other; but a most intimate union, without conversion, composition, or confusion. In a manner analogous to this, man becomes a partaker of the divine nature by the actual indwelling of the Holy Ghost, the third person of the Godhead. There is no absorption or transmutation of his essence; he is man still, soul and body. But every power and every fiber of his being is permeated and interpenetrated by the Spirit of the Lord; and in virtue thereof, a divine glory and energy exhibited in his whole being and activity, which furnish to the universe the supreme and overwhelming demonstration of the existence, presence and power of the great Jehovah. Man is made like unto his exalted Saviour, who is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person. The image of the glorified Son of man is stamped on the glorified sons of men. A divine majesty and glory evince the inhabitation of God through the Spirit. The human essence abides, but in, with, and through it, there is ever a manifestation of divine virtues. God is brought as nearly face to face with the universe as seems possible. His eternal power and godhead stand forth in the material creation, but the glory thereof has been obscured, and matter itself declared to be eternal; yea, to be God himself. In glorified humanity we have the manifestation of deity in a living, thinking, self-conscious agent, with a glory incapable of obscuration; with an evidence that necessitates conviction. All but the essence of the absolute personal Deity may here be gazed upon by created intelligences. In confirmation of what is now said, and at the same time to guard against the error of supposing that man partakes of the *essential* nature of the Godhead, the apostle does not write *φύσεως τοῦ θεοῦ*, but *θείας φύσεως*. It is not *θεότης* that presents itself to the gaze of the universe in redeemed humanity—that

were impossible,—but *θεϊότης*, and that with a surpassing fullness and efficacy.*

The other passage is Heb. xii: 10: "For they (fathers of our flesh) verily for a few days chastened us for their own pleasure; but he (the Father of spirits) for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness (*τῆς ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ*)." Here again is an expression every way peculiar and remarkable. It is not partakers of holiness in general, in the abstract, but partakers of *his* holiness—the holiness of God. If it be compared with Paul's frequently recurring phrase, *righteousness of God*, the righteousness which is by the faith of Jesus Christ, the thought at once occurs that this is a *divine* righteousness—the righteousness of him who is "JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS," imputed to us and received by faith. It is not a creature righteousness; it is not righteousness in the abstract, but a most peculiar and special righteousness, even that wrought out by the obedience of the incarnate Son of God. Here also, then, to interpret the phrase, "partakers of his holiness," as nothing more than an equivalent to moral purity, is to do violence to both the native force of language and the analogy of Scripture. It can not be fully or fairly expounded by a reference to those texts in which the terms *holy* and *holiness* may be supposed to denote simply freedom from all stain of sin, or perfect rectitude of heart and conduct. There is a broader and higher sense of holiness, in which sense God is said to be "glorious in holiness." It is that infinite lustre of the divine perfections which shone in Jehovah-Jesus as revealed to the prophet Isaiah. Before its matchless splendors the Seraphim covered their faces and cried one unto another, saying, "Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of Hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory." It is the summation of the infinite excellences of God, which imparts an infinite glory to his character; by which he swears; by which he is distinguished, and wills above all things else to be distinguished, from all other beings. In this sense the epithet *holy* is applied by Hannah in her prayer-song (1 Sam. ii: 2): "There is none holy as Jehovah;" by the victorious ones who sing the song of Moses and the Lamb

*The reader is referred to the second article in Trench's *Synonyms of the New Testament*, as an appropriate conclusion to these remarks on 2 Pet. i: 4.

(Rev. xv: 4): "Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou *only* art holy;" and by the four beasts (Rev. iv: 8), who "rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come." In this sense the psalmist uses it, when he says, "Exalt ye Jehovah our God, and worship at his footstool; for he is holy." Holiness is that in God to which the most profound reverence in creatures is the corresponding affection. "Holy and reverend is his name." To be a partaker, therefore, of the holiness of God, is nothing less than to share in the glory of divine perfections. The elect sinner is predestinated to be conformed to the image of the Son of God, in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead, and therefore is "filled unto (up to) all the fullness of God;" that is, filled as God is filled,—the immense perfections of the divine essence filling, and shining through, redeemed humanity. The glorified saint becomes the Shekinah of Deity. Let it be observed, too, it is to the *image* of the Son he is conformed, who is himself declared to be "the *image* of the invisible God." Bengel says, "an *image invisible* according to the divine nature; *visible* according to the human:" yet in the human nature he *so* imaged the invisible personal God, that Nathaniel exclaimed, "Thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel." When Christ comes "to be glorified in his saints," their sonship will be attested by their bearing the image of him who is the image of God. There is this difference, however, as to the ground of the representation: to Christ belongs the actual *essentia* of the Godhead, the real *θεότης divitas*; to the saints, *θεότης* only, divinitas. He, therefore, is an object of worship; they not. But by the indwelling of God, the Holy Ghost, the divine efficient agent alike in creation and redemption, and through whom Christ offered himself without spot to God, the glorified saint is filled with the fullness of God. The perfections of deity shine forth in and through him with a transcendant effulgence and power. Every element of his being is instinct with the life of God. The glory of a divine sanctitude rests upon him. In this way, and in the broadest and most exalted sense of the word *holiness*, man is made a partaker of the holiness of God. And in this consummation of

his being and destiny, he reaches the ultimate limit and glory of a created existence.

It only remains to point out, in a concluding part, the relation of the New Life of the Redeemed to some of the distinctive doctrines of the faith.

ART. VI.—*The Nation and the Insurgents.*—*With Special Reference to the Political, Military, Material, and Financial Condition of the Country, to the State of the Insurgent War, and to the Foreign Relations of the United States, at the End of the Year 1863.*

THE Nation has just manifested one of those popular reactions which distinguish all great commotions among men, and which operate with vehement force in all great revolutions. From the election of Mr. Lincoln till the autumn of 1862, the Government and the people of the loyal States, moving in concert, and marching in a direction which was itself a reaction against the extreme opinions which had prevailed in the Northern States, presented such an aspect of justice, moderation, and power, as seemed to leave no doubt of the early and complete extinction of the Rebellion. At that period a great and most critical division of the loyal people manifested itself. The popular elections which occurred in the autumn of 1862, exhibited a powerful and, as far as those elections permitted, a triumphant popular reaction against the newly-avowed principles of the Federal Administration. We have discussed the causes of that reaction, as it was manifested in the Papers of the President, and the votes of the people, and we were convinced it would grow, and become permanent, if it were honestly directed to the avowed objects of it.* It was not so directed. It was attempted to be diverted into a party, instead of a national movement. It was abused for the purpose of restoring the Democratic party to power, instead of preserving the nation and the constitution. Nay, it was pros-

* See Danville Review, December, 1862, pp. 670-712.

tituted to Democratic, rather than National objects, in a manner as disgraceful as success would have made it fatal. What we behold in the recent elections is the indignant rejection by the nation of this flagitious attempt; the rejection of the imposture that the national condemnation of certain principles and purposes of the Abolition party in 1862, meant the indorsement of still more fatal principles and purposes of the Peace Democracy in 1863. This, we understand to be the significance of these two apparently inconsistent, but really perfectly coherent, movements of the nation. By that of 1862, the nation announced its hostility to the principles of the new war policy of the Administration; by that of 1863, it has declared its hostility to any project for committing the fate of the nation into the hands of the Democratic party—and, least of all, into the hands of the disloyal portion of that party. And however difficult it may be to foresee the course of events, we are of opinion that both of these great judgments of the nation—however they may be misconstrued, or abused—will not only stand as land-marks from which it will not much depart, but will grow in importance and efficacy.

No doubt the hands of the Administration will be greatly strengthened by these elections of the summer and fall of 1863—just as they must also be strengthened by every success on its part, and by every failure of the attempts of its enemies. Still, however, temporary strength may be gained at the terrible risk of permanent weakness. At the commencement of Mr. Lincoln's Administration, there could hardly be said to be any organized opposition to him in the loyal States, or any serious or decided opposition in those States to the maintenance of the Union and the crushing of the Rebellion by force. At present, there is probably no loyal State in which there is not an organized and powerful opposition to his Administration, a deep and envenomed mutual hostility of parties alike claiming to be loyal, and an uncertainty more or less serious hanging over every important election. This state of things is extremely to be deplored—it is in a high degree perilous. So far as Mr. Lincoln and his Administration can be fairly considered responsible for it, every wise man will understand that they thereby endanger the very objects they have in view—

may, every object dear to the heart of every patriot. No real statesman, especially none in a country of laws and of freedom, ever imagined that fundamental social changes could be accomplished, unless by the common consent of society, nor judged that even if they could be accomplished otherwise, they were fit to be insisted on, if, in the common judgment, they cost far more than they come to. So far as parties striving for ascendancy are responsible for the state of things we have depicted, they ought to understand that the nation can be saved only by the nation; and that what is true forever is signally true now and of them—their mutual destruction by means of their mutual devourings. In times of great national peril, whatever party makes party objects or party ascendancy, the chief or even a principal object of its efforts, brands itself as corrupt, and utterly to be detested. The mutual treason of the factions in Jerusalem filled the doomed city with woe—till the avenging sword of Titus smote them all with destruction. The rival factions in Constantinople delivered up the Greek Empire to perdition, rather than forego the luxury of mutual slaughter. On the contrary, the whole glory and strength of England rest on nothing more deeply than on the ardor with which every faction, at every national danger, hurries to the support of the one that happens to be in power. The business of Mr. Lincoln, the business of every party and every faction, the business of every citizen of the Republic, the pre-eminent business of them all, each in his lot, is first of all, and above all, to break the military power of the rebellious States, and restore the supremacy of the constitution, the laws, and the government, over every foot of land, and every soul of man. Whoever will not do this, except on some impossible or scandalous condition—whoever will not do it, except with some object forbidden by law, reason and humanity—whoever will not do it at all—every one of them, calling himself loyal, deserves the execration of mankind and the vengeance of God. The great political problem, then, immediately before the nation for solution is, whether this evil spirit of division and distrust, which first hurried the rebels to destruction, has so fastened on us, as to render us incapable of what God has set before us, and unworthy of his further protection? It is a

problem which the Administration on one side, and the loyal people on the other, must determine, as they will answer to all nations, to posterity, and to God. Nor can anything be more clear than the fundamental principles which ought to regulate the action of both—the Administration carrying out the great and legitimate objects of the war in a manner not only deserving, but conciliating the cordial approbation of all loyal people—and all such people giving the most determined support to the Administration.

The strength imparted to the Government by these recent elections—and the weakness resulting from the great organized opposition, and the mutual violence of parties; present unitedly an aspect of the general condition, not very easy to be estimated, without taking into consideration the corresponding condition of the Confederate States. Their divisions may be even more perilous, though less obvious, than ours. Their difficulties, arising from immense, though cautiously expressed, hostility to the proceedings of their Government, may be even greater and more dangerous than anything that has been manifested among us. The dominant party, and the Government among them, may be in such a condition, that even a total change of Administration with us, would not arrest our triumph over them. Their Government may be laboring under far more powerful causes tending to weaken it with the people, than ours is; and no source, at all, of increase in popular strength may be left to it. If these statements indicate in some just degree, the state of parties and of public feeling among the people of the Rebel States; it is very obvious that conditions of parties and of public feeling among ourselves, that might otherwise fill us with extreme anxiety, sink correspondingly in the scale of importance. We have no doubt that, to a wide extent, all this is true; and that to all these causes the Confederate Government must add many others, the united effect of the whole of which is not only to weaken its influence from day to day, but to make its existence precarious. With a sense of the hopelessness of the contest in which they are engaged; a conviction that total ruin is the only result which is to be expected from its desperate continuance; the deceptions which the leading classes of the Rebels have practised upon the mass of the people, fill them with intense bitterness. The frightful oppression and misery

which, for the sake of utterly deceptive hopes and promises, the people have endured, rankle in their hearts. Ruined, betrayed, exhausted under a pitiless military despotism—how is it possible that a people, even in the lowest stages of civilization, can fail, at last, to execrate a government, which bestows on them no blessing, and heaps upon them ceaseless injuries, indignities, and wrongs? There is no ground for doubt, that immense portions of the rebel armies have been forced into service against their will, and would immediately quit the service if they could. It is well known, that on various occasions, large bodies of rebel troops have mutinied, and been subdued, or pacified, with the greatest difficulty; and many indications render it far from improbable, that the Rebel Government, if not subdued by us more speedily than seems to be expected at present, will be overthrown by domestic insurrection. The universal testimony which reaches the loyal States from the vast rebel territories successively occupied by our troops, and from the multitudes of rebel deserters and refugees who come within our lines, concur in proving all that we are here concerned to know upon this point. The Confederate Administration has relatively far less hold on the rebel population, than the Federal Administration has upon the loyal population. The violations of life, liberty, property, and every conceivable right bestowed on man by nature, by constitutions and by laws, are a thousand-fold more numerous and extreme, by the Confederate Government in the rebel States, than the wildest accusations have ever intimated against the Federal Government in the loyal States. With us, discontent may manifest itself freely and in every possible way, so that it stops short of crime; with them, discontent dare not even be whispered, without danger of incurring, without trial, punishment due only to the highest crimes; and still, as soon as the face of society there is even partially uncovered, enough is seen to show that discontent is relatively far deeper and wider in most, if not all parts of the rebel States, than in any portion of the loyal States. Nor can it be doubted that there are more refugees from the rebel States into the loyal States than vice versa; and more soldiers from the South in the Northern Armies, than vice versa; and that, in both respects, these facts are becoming more marked every day. When we consider that the white population of the loyal States is five times as great as that of the rebel

States, such facts do not admit of any explanation inconsistent with the one we have given to them. And the conclusion is as clear as it well could be under existing circumstances, that whatever may be the amount of loss of cordial popular support, under which the Federal Government may find itself obliged at present to prosecute the war; that sort of loss of support is relatively far greater as regards the present condition of the Confederate Government. Nor could any conclusion be more important, or decisive, touching the future course of the war, and its conclusion. Undoubtedly the personal fame of President Lincoln, and the supreme interest of the country, demand that he should shape his course and pursue it, in such a way as to satisfy the nation, and carry with him every loyal heart in it. But if this may not be, undoubtedly it should be a great support to him in his honest efforts to crush this Rebellion, and a great joy to every patriot who feels his immense obligation to support the President in his great work, whether he approves or disapproves of any part, or even the whole, of his mode of doing it; to perceive clearly that the political ability of the Government to accomplish the great work set before it, even though apparently diminished, is relatively as great, perhaps greater than it ever was.

In what we have said, we have alluded only to the state of public feeling in the Confederacy, as affecting the ability of the Rebel Government to carry on the war with any prospect of success. But there are many other causes, some of them far more obvious than this one, which seem to show that the cause of the Rebellion is irrecoverably lost, if not that its catastrophe is near at hand. More than half of the inhabited territory claimed as constituting the Confederacy when the war began, has been overrun, and is now held by the Federal troops. This portion embraces more than half of the white population of the whole Confederacy in the largest extent ever claimed by the rebels. All the rest of the Confederate territory, counting it by States, is the theater of actual war; there being, we believe, at this moment not a single State ever claimed by them, which is not invaded by a Federal force; while there is not more than a single one that has been taken from them by our armies, in which an armed Rebel force of any considerable strength now exists. They have claimed innumerable victories, and admitted

almost no defeats: but this is the actual result of the war, up to the hour at which we write. Their armies now in the field are far less numerous than ever before, and have been gathered, to a large extent, by a species of conscription, which, for utter brutality, never had a parallel. In the progress of these immense conquests which have rewarded the valor of the Federal armies, the Confederacy has lost almost its entire coast line on the sea, and most of its strongest fortresses inland, and has been cut in two from north to south, and had most of its great interior means of communication taken or destroyed. Vast regions have been laid waste by successive campaigns of great armies; every vestige of public works has been destroyed over the fairest portions of many States—towns, villages, and rural improvements have been consumed by fire—the production of the very necessities of life is no longer possible in a degree equal to the demands of nature—and amidst the blank despair which is settling like a pall over the face of the land—the white male population fit to replenish the Confederate armies, no longer exists, the armies as they stand constitute the last hope of those insane classes, whose crimes and follies have wrought this mournful devastation. To add to this great ruin, the Confederate government, not content to replenish their armies by violence, and to support them by plunder, so managed the finances of the country as to produce universal bankruptcy; and so arranged their currency and their sumptuary laws, that the pay of the soldier is worth six cents on the dollar, and a pound of meat or grain is limited in price to about one half the cost of producing it. Now, in the midst of such a scene of unutterable discomfiture, even while we weep over it, we must not allow ourselves to forget that the Rebellion, out of which all this wo has come, was the supreme and premeditated crime against all national independence, all regulated liberty, and all secure and permanent civilization. Nor while we faintly depict it—not to rejoice over or to insult so much misery—but to make our country see the certainty of its own triumph; must we forget that every day since this war began, it has rested absolutely with the Rebels, who began it without cause, to put an end to it. The nation mourned over its outbreak; it hesitated long, before it resolutely drew the sword; nothing less, perhaps, than the preservation of its own existence, would have carried it through the

terrible work it has accomplished thus far. If she is true to herself, it is only the direct interposition of God himself, that can prevent her from achieving it thoroughly. When that is done, may God grant our people and our rulers grace and wisdom to deal with our conquered brethren—not as they have dealt with us—but as we would they should deal with us, if their case were ours. So will our glory and our safety be both complete.

In the first of the series of publications, of which this is one, we attempted, nearly three years ago (January 1861), to make such a classification of the slave States, as would point out with simplicity and clearness, the great difference in their several relations to the insurrection which was just begun.* Some of them we called *cotton* States, some *non-cotton*, and the remainder *mixed*, embracing in the last class those States which produced cotton, but not as their great staple. The subsequent career of these States, has illustrated the force of the suggestions then made; and their fate will, probably, confirm their justice. The non-cotton slave States, Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, and part of Virginia (the new State of West Virginia), the only States falling strictly into that class; may be all said to be as securely bound to the Federal Union,—variously as that result has been severally reached by them,—as if there had never been an attempt to take them out of it. On the other hand, it has been mainly through the extreme hostility of the thoroughly cotton States, that the insurrection they organized at first, ever assumed such great proportions, or came to be conducted with such ferocious barbarity. It is upon this class of States that the issues of this war will fall with a consuming force, proportionate to their own insane hatred of their country; and it is within their borders that the roots of every evil passion may be expected to live the longest, after the war is over. According to their population, they began this war, among the richest communities in the world; they will end it probably among the poorest on the face of the earth. Between this firm and settled loyalty which already reigns in the non-cotton States, and this malignant treason which characterizes the conduct of the cotton States, is the still hesitating and uncertain posture of the mixed States. Some portions,—as Old

* Danville Review, for June, 1861, pp. 319–341.

Virginia,—still contend madly ; some, as Tennessee, are occupied by our armies,—but still in peril, waiting on events,—but with a tendency more and more loyal ; some, as Arkansas, are really conquered, but hardly yet subdued ; some, as North Carolina, still give their troops to the rebel cause, and while they dread the future, live in habitual discontent,—and refuse to allow the war to be fought out within their borders. It is these mixed States, which, in general, while the war continues, will preserve themselves from its ravages, as far as may be possible, and when the war is over, will in good faith, quietly accept its results,—like sane men who fail in a desperate undertaking, are accustomed to do. From the non-cotton States, therefore, taken as a class, which were neutralized by division at first, as determined support as the government will any where obtain, will be rendered to it in the further prosecution of the war. This is more than a third of the support, on which the rebel cause originally relied. The mixed States will no longer oppose to the government, any force at all comparable to that they have heretofore put forth ; rather they will hereafter afford it aid, bearing fair proportion to that they will give our enemies. But this class of States embraces a force at least as great as that possessed by the cotton States. It is thus chiefly from the cotton States, two of which (Louisiana and Mississippi) are already conquered and exhausted,—that the greater part of the resistance must come, which the government will have to encounter, in the further progress of the war. It is made apparent, therefore, by this statement, the leading facts of which are notorious,—that the resistance which the confederate government is able to offer in future campaigns, is not underrated in the previous statements of this article. What seemed to us perfectly manifest, from the beginning,—has proceeded a great way in being actually realized. It was impossible for the revolted States,—even if they had been guided by the highest human wisdom, to have achieved, by force, under the circumstances in which they attempted it, the overthrow of the Federal Government, the partition of this great Republic, and the erection of a new nation out of the slave States. If the people of the Northern States could have been kept united, and had been as thoroughly loyal as the patriotic party in the border slave States, or even as the loyal men in the States which seceded ; a really superior administration ought to

have been able to crush the insurrection, thoroughly and at once. Comparing what has been done, with what remains to be done, in order to break up completely the military power of the insurgents,—the work left seems to us to be far the smaller, and far the less difficult part; while the force which the insurgents can still oppose to the Federal arms is reduced in every important particular to less,—perhaps far less,—than half of that they could once command. It is possible their armed force may not be numerically reduced one half; but a country whose armies are being constantly reduced by the casualties of war, without the possibility of recruiting them, or supporting them in the highest state of efficiency,—while every other element of power is fatally reduced, is already lost. Serious doubt, too, has come to obscure the great fact so often and so vehemently asserted,—that one rebel can whip five Yankees; especially after the one rebel comes to be destitute of money, clothes and food. Nor do the most diligent inquiries reveal the existence of that *last ditch*,—or that willingness of the whole insurgent population to die in it,—which unitedly have formed so great an element of their boasted invincibility.

We deem it proper to say distinctly,—though the candid reader could understand nothing else, from all we have written concerning this rebellion,—that it is not the entire population of the revolted States we mean to embrace, in the stern condemnation we have been obliged to utter continually. On the contrary we have constantly asserted our belief, that a very large proportion of that population, was far more the victims than the abettors of the terrible wickedness; and our conviction that the whole power of the nation should be put forth, to deliver and protect this great portion of our Southern people, if there were no other motive for the war. And all the world knows, that many thousands of heroic men and women in all parts of the Confederacy, have braved every human danger, and encountered sufferings such as only savages are thought capable of inflicting, rather than even appear to connive at the atrocious proceedings around them; martyrs to their duty and their country, whose blood and tears give to the nation a title to the land which drank them up, more sacred than every claim by which it possessed that land before. Nor will we deny that, notwithstanding all the horrors which the dominant party has perpetrated in the

name of the South; still there are multitudes of considerations which prompt wise men to forbearance in dealing with them,—and awaken in generous men those powerful sympathies which once bound them to us. But we can not, we dare not, cover up crimes and villainies, whose enormities cry to God continually for vengeance,—and whose free course and successful termination, involve not only the widest and most complete ruin, but the very existence of the nation, which, of all nations, the human race most needs should live. Nor will we take upon our soul the guilt of failing to denounce, with all the energy of which we are capable, the men, the parties, and the States, who have wrought such cruel desolation, by means never exceeded in wickedness, and with objects as detestable as ever entered the mind of man.

From the point we have now reached in developing the general view we wish to present, we are better prepared to direct our attention, more particularly, to the actual condition of the nation, considered apart from the revolted States,—and with special reference to its ability to terminate the war, speedily and triumphantly. And we may say, at once, that while, from the beginning, we never had a doubt of the redundant ability of the nation to crush the insurrection, any more than we had of its supreme duty to do so; the events of the whole intervening period since the war began, taken all together, appear to us to have tended constantly and directly to prove that the actual work was being steadily accomplished; and now, as it seems to us, the actual condition of the nation, at this moment, is such,—as we have said of the Confederacy in reviewing the present state of the insurrection, that the failure of the nation to accomplish the work thoroughly, is an event justly to be considered impossible, according to the ordinary course of human events. If this view of public affairs is just, it is the more important that it should be clearly stated and understood; as thereby the secret treasons and conspiracies which are perpetually agitating society in the loyal States, may be seen to be as gratuitous as they are dangerous to the authors of them, and may be abandoned; while the friends of the Union in the revolted States may take heart at the certain, and perhaps, near approach of deliverance, too long delayed,—and insurgents of every class may be warned that all that is left to them, is to make provision

for their own safety. The sooner, too, we can extirpate the unspeakable folly, which has done so much harm,—that this insurrection is one of those revolutions which, as the outcry is, never go back; the better it will be for those, who learn at last, through the wreck they have made, and for all who have abetted them, that few revolutions, in the history of mankind, have failed to go back, first or last,—and that no insurrection ever went forward.

First of all, in estimating the present ability of the nation to crush the remaining military power of the insurrection, is the question of men to fight its battles. This question, after all we have heretofore written concerning it, needs only a general explanation here. When the war began, there were, according to the usual rate of estimation, five and a half millions—or possibly six millions of fighting men in the country;—of whom not above one million and a quarter, or possibly one million only—could be fairly assigned to the population claimed by the insurgents. There remained, therefore, to the nation, available for the purposes of the war, from four to five millions of fighting men—nearer five than four, probably. Not more than a million and a quarter, perhaps not more than a million of these, have been called into the Federal service. So that there remain not less than three millions of fighting men in the loyal states who have not taken up arms; while, as our previous statements show, the number of fighting men who have not taken up arms as yet among the insurgents does not probably exceed one hundred thousand. Allowing the whole number called into the field, the number rendered incapable of further service, and the number of veterans now under arms, to be about equal on each side; what is to be decided, is, the ability of the remaining one hundred thousand insurgents, to fight the three millions of remaining loyal men. If one party were five times as strong as the other—and the losses were equal; as soon as they lost a million of men each,—the stronger side retained four-fifths of its strength, while the weaker side had spent its entire strength. This is the process which has actually been going on—the result towards which the parties have been rapidly tending—the end which must necessarily be reached when a bloody war is carried on, between those who are very strong, and those who are not strong at all. In the earlier stages of such a war, and for a

limited time, a certain equality of force may be brought into the field, and doubts may appear to cover the result; but as the end approaches—the explanation just given, shows how the success of the powerful party must necessarily advance at a constantly increased rate. Nothing can be more certain, or, as we suppose, more obvious, than these facts and results; and the whole of this war completely illustrates the inevitable force of the process, and has constantly tended to the unavoidable result. It never was a question, with us, of Greeks against Asiatics; but of one American against four or five others—either of the four or five as good a man as the one, perhaps better. It never was a question, with us, of the weak party fighting in some sacred cause, and the strong one in some vile and dishonorable one; but of the strong party upholding a cause of the highest glory and the supremest necessity, and the weak party fighting without even a decent pretext, for objects in part utterly preposterous, and in part desperately wicked. How, then, is it possible to doubt that the cause of the nation, in respect of an adequate warlike population, is invincibly strong, in any comparison whatever; and in comparison with the weakness of the confederates, growing stronger continually? How can the final success of the insurgent cause be any longer even imagined, except upon the basis of some change in the condition of the parties—which only a miracle could produce? Two or three hundred thousand veteran insurgents, with almost no available reserve of fighting men, might protract the war and do much mischief; but that they can finally, or even long, maintain themselves against an equal number of Federal veterans, with a reserve that is practically inexhaustible, can not be imagined. If these insurgent troops are so embittered against the United States, that they are resolved to brave any fortune, sooner than return to their allegiance to it; how much better would it be for them to quit the desperate folly and mischief they are now engaged in—and escaping the destruction which awaits them—march into Mexico, drive the French out of it—and followed by their women and children—establish themselves in some portion of Spanish North America, where all who choose to share their fortunes, might join them from the United States, and where they would lay the foundations of a glorious future. It would be a wonderful thing, if in the providence of God, this monstrous

conspiracy against the existence of the United States as one of the great nations of the earth,—should end in making it still more powerful and durable, than it was before; in totally changing the condition of the black race on this continent, and by consequence, in some degree, throughout the world; in creating a great Protestant Anglo-Saxon nation, in the vast region on this continent, so long abused by Papal and Latin races; besides working out in regard of two great European nations, results in all respects the opposite of those they hoped to derive from our ruin. No event, in modern times, has been so fruitful as the war to establish the independence of this nation. Who need doubt, that the far more terrible war waged to maintain and perpetuate the existence then won, might be used by God, in a manner far more fruitful?

It can not be denied that a considerable portion of the immense fighting material, still untouched in the loyal States, is not loyal. It would be a thousand times more proper, and no doubt, just as easy, to make this element effectual in defence of the country; as it was for the rebels to make the large loyal element amongst them, efficacious in attacking us. Amidst the ceaseless clamor against the oppressions of the Federal Government, it is really its extreme clemency in dealing with this disloyal class, scattered over the loyal States, that has made them dangerous. There is no doubt that if great reverses were to befall the national cause, traitors would openly appear in every part of the country,—and take active part against it. There is no doubt, that they have participated in every form of mischief, and had a part in all the evil that has been done, and that they are now more or less organized secretly, in every State of the Union, for treasonable purposes. Every body knows,—who cares to know,—that there was a conspiracy covering the United States,—one part of which was to burn every principal city therein; and that the attempt of the Irish Catholic mob to burn New York, immediately after the last raid of Morgan, and the last invasion of Maryland by Lee, —was an outbreak of that conspiracy. Nobody, we suppose, now doubts that it was by means of this conspiracy, that all disloyal men, and multitudes who profess to be loyal, succeeded in practically defeating the last draft for Federal soldiers, and making it, in effect, almost fruitless. Some of the principles of the law providing for that draft, were, in our judgment, erroneous; as,

for example, that one allowing service to be commuted by money,—which, in the actual state of the country, was a total mistake,—and worked great evil in every direction. It is also true, that besides the disloyal portion of the people, who will not fight for the country, if they can avoid it; there are great multitudes of men of the proper age for military service, and who claim to be loyal, who never were inclined to arms, and are now less so than ever. We suppose that a million of men have voluntarily taken up arms, on the federal side. This is a very large proportion, of all who are loyal and subject to military duty, to rush into it, without other motives than a sense of duty, love of country, and the attractions of the service; and we suppose a very large proportion of those who do this, and remain fit for service, will continue in it. The two ways in which the opponents of the government most naturally seek to embarrass it, are by carrying the elections against it, and by preventing the supply of soldiers from being sufficient. They have, probably, been more successful in the latter, than in the former method. The number of deserters from the army has been utterly disgraceful; and appears to have been increased, rather than diminished, by the system of commuting service for money, and by increasing bounties until they have become enormous. One constant hindrance to the getting of privates for the army may be looked for in the incompetency and unsuitableness of a large proportion of the officers, and especially of those above company officers, under whom they have to serve. A man of good morals dreads the risk of serving under an officer notoriously of bad morals; while a man of sense and courage, very unwillingly puts his life and character, at the disposal of an officer whom no one believes to be fit for his situation, except, perhaps, those who put him in it. While, therefore, serious difficulties may exist in the matter of the adequate supply of troops,—difficulties created in part by the character of too many of the officers of the army; in part by the active opposition of the enemies of the government; in part by the reluctance of the men fit for service, to enter the army; and in part by the improper principles made prominent, in some of the laws under which troops have been raised: the right of the country to the services of every man in it, remains its clearest and highest right; the duty of the government, to enforce this right promptly and as often

and far as the interest of the country requires, is paramount,—and the exigencies of the situation imperatively demand that this duty should be performed, and this right enforced. Let not the work be done negligently or deceitfully, and so bring down on us the ridicule of our enemies, the scorn of wise men, and the displeasure of God. The government,—if it will do its own duty wisely,—may rely, with great confidence, on obtaining the flower of the nation as volunteers; so far as the sense of duty, the love of country, and the delight in the excitement, the honor, and the rewards of the military life, can carry men. After that, what is to be relied on is neither commutation money, nor enormous bounties, but the right of the country, and obedience to the laws which enforce that right. To-day, the militia of the nation ought to be in a state of thorough organization and drill; ready to repel invasion, fit to act, as they stand, and in whatever mass, and on whatever service. Are they in that condition, to the extent of the tenth part of them? The army ought to be recruited, if volunteers do not offer,—by draft, or lot, upon some fair, simple, uniform plan, that would, little by little, but always sufficiently, keep its ranks full.* The work should be done as a steady, necessary, and proper business, required by the safety and the glory of the country, and maintained by the whole force of the nation; while all tricks, commutations, trafficking, starts and scares, should be utterly and forever put aside. Done thus,

* While we are in the act of preparing this paper, we learn by the newspapers that the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in session at Pittsburg, has decided that the existing Act of Congress by which the drafting of soldiers for the Federal army is regulated, is *unconstitutional*. The decision, as we gather, was upon the preliminary portion of several cases,—the application, namely, of several drafted soldiers for injunctions arresting the further proceedings of the federal officers in these cases, till they could be fully heard, on their merits. The elaborate decisions which seem to have been given, however, on these initiatory proceedings, leave little doubt that the same court will decide in the same way, on final hearing; Judges Lowrie, Woodward and Thompson, for declaring the Act of Congress unconstitutional, and Judges Strong and Read, for sustaining the law as constitutional. We have seen only portions of Chief Justice Lowrie's, and Justice Strong's opinions. As far as we understand Judge Lowrie's reasoning, we must say, with all due respect, that we consider it preposterous; and the ruling of the court, if it be law, which we are satisfied it is not, and if it is acquiesced in by the country, which we are sure it never can be, virtually renders the existence of an effective and powerful federal army, impossible in any protracted war; and the national defeat and disgrace not impossible

war can be carried on, so far as the furnishing of troops is concerned, with absolute punctuality,—and until all who fight such a nation, become tired of it. Upon any other principles, nothing can be more confused, costly, uncertain, and ineffectual. What a comment on our country would it be, to say that with three millions of fighting men who have never been in service, the army can not be adequately recruited; the government can not devise and execute a practically effective system of drafting; and every body sets to work at purchasing troops by the head, at enormous prices, out of a joint fund! There is not an army in the world, that can stand a large infusion of troops purchased of themselves one by one, on the mere mercenary idea. Even at the height of the idea of mercenary troops, in times past,—nothing of this sort was thought of. To let out the war by contract,—could be hardly more scandalous or dangerous.

What effects will be produced upon the *numerical* strength of the army, by the effort on the part of the government to raise black troops, from the negroes and mulattoes, bond and free, of the United States, is very difficult to tell beforehand. What effect may be produced upon the spirit and efficiency of the army—upon the estimate which the country puts upon the army—upon the feelings of the army towards the government, and upon the general feeling of the country, towards the Administration which has resorted to this expedient; is perhaps, at this moment, still more difficult to determine, with truth and justice. The army and the country, have, apparently and to a certain extent, so far acquiesced in the wishes and plans of the President, that in a certain sense they are being executed. It is possible the Confederate Government may be driven by extreme necessity to follow the example of the President, and arm the slaves of the insurgents; the free negroes and mulattoes, they had already armed, to a considerable extent (two regiments, for example, at least, in Louisi-

even at the present stage of the present war. For the gist of it seems to be, that the Federal Government, though expressly empowered by the Constitution to "*raise and support armies*," can not do this, except by raising volunteers, and can not do it that way, so as to interfere materially with the militia of any State. Of what advantage is a Constitution, that a live nation can't look at, without breaking it; and that won't allow the great Republic even to die with courage and dignity?

ana) before a single negro soldier was enlisted in the Federal service. What effect such a proceeding on their part might have on the progress and result of the war, we will not stop to discuss; any more than we will now stop to discuss the consequences to the nation, of being possibly found, at the close of the war, with an immense army of veteran negro soldiers, part in the rebel and part in the federal service, in her bosom, claiming all the rights of American citizens, and prepared to enforce those rights. We suppose that the overwhelming majority of the officers and soldiers of our armies, is decidedly opposed to the whole idea of raising negro troops, of using them, or of risking the fate of the war, in any degree upon them. We also suppose, that a decided majority of the people in the loyal states are firmly opposed to the whole of that particular policy of the President, which has resulted in the raising of negro troops; notwithstanding immense masses of those people may so far acquiesce in the whole, or any part of that peculiar policy, as the state of parties obliged them to do, or else to aid in obstructing and opposing the President, in other parts of his policy which they cordially approve, and consider most instantly important—and their defeat most incurable. The temper of the army was well understood by the President, when he wisely organized the black troops in a distinct body, under a peculiar name, and disabled its officers from commanding white officers or troops; and the general character and previous rank of the bulk of the officers appointed exclusively for these black troops, discloses plainly enough the sense in which the whole subject was understood. In like manner, as we have before said, the popular vote of the autumn of 1862, is a recorded, and we think, unrepealed verdict, against that whole peculiar policy; and if that question could come before the people of the loyal states to day, clearly and by itself; "*negro equality with the white man,*"—as citizen or soldier—or "*the negro as he was*"—we have no doubt that the majority for the latter, would be perfectly overwhelming. For our own part, we trust in God that the progress of events will reveal some middle ground, upon which the Southern States may be saved from helpless destruction and anarchy, when the war is triumphantly ended; upon which all who really compassionate the black

race, and would ameliorate its sad fate, may meet; upon which our constitutional liberty may be maintained, at the same time that we effectually vindicate our national existence and glory; upon which the sacredness of vested rights and of national faith, may be shown to be the foundation of all political security and true progress, instead of its being possible for their breach to promote any lasting good. But we will not be seduced incidentally into such great topics, upon which the question before us does not immediately hang; and with regard to which, we have heretofore spoken with entire freedom.* The existence of the nation far exceeds in importance, the continuance or the overthrow of any particular interest of any portion of it; and the triumph of constitutional government and regulated freedom, over the military anarchy of the insurgents, must not be put at hazard by unnatural constructions forced upon existing institutions. Our grand necessity is victory. For that we will forbear much, endure much. With victory, no man need doubt that the nation will find a way, or make one, to rectify whatever serious wrong may have been committed in securing it. Without it, we, and our untimely zeal for objects that are unattainable and interests comparatively subordinate, and all those objects and interests as well, must enter the same gulf in which the life and hopes of the nation are swallowed up, and from which—whatever may emerge after generations of agony—this glorious Republic will come forth no more.

In estimating the actual position of the country, and its probable future, with special relation to the war, next to the state of public sentiment, and to the military resources—both of which have been considered—it naturally follows to speak of the general material ability of the country—its wealth, its resources, its prosperity, its general capacity to meet the protracted and enormous pressure upon it. We have already pointed out the frightful condition of the Confederate States, considered as a whole, in all these respects. For a contest on so vast a scale, this war may be already called long. It is approaching three years since the madmen at Charleston fired

* See Danville Review for December, 1862, pp. 630-713.

on Fort Sumter, by direction of the southern senators at Washington city, expressly to render further union and peace impossible; and about the same length of time since their fellow-madmen in Mississippi, acting under the same direction, commenced firing upon steamboats navigating the great river of the country, expressly to make the dull Yankees comprehend that war actually existed. How complete is the desolation which has fallen upon Mississippi and those portions of South Carolina—the finest portions—heretofore made the seat of war; and what rational being can consider any retribution too severe that God, in his providence, may bring on the remaining portions of it?

The sufferings and injuries which have been brought upon the greater part of Missouri and Kentucky, the whole of West Virginia, and certain portions of Maryland, have been extremely severe, and have, no doubt, weakened the resources of all those States, and temporarily destroyed them in the portions most frequently and brutally sacked. But still, no extensive portion of either of those States is in a condition comparable for wretchedness to any portion of the vast Confederate territory which has been the permanent seat of hostilities; and other very large portions of them possess great resources available for war. Thousands of persons have been ruined; most generally, persons whose property, to a large extent, lay in rebel States, or whose business had so involved them with rebels, as to bring them within the compass of rebel confiscations, or rebel bankruptcy; and persons literally robbed of all movable property by rebel invaders, and burned out of house and home by them. Upon the whole, the resources of the vast loyal border slave territory—stretching continuously fifteen hundred miles, from the Atlantic coast of Delaware and Maryland to the western border of Missouri—though no doubt actually reduced, are available to the support of the war more extensively and more effectively than heretofore. The great border slave-region has suffered a hundred-fold more than any other region of equal extent that adheres to the Federal Government; but it is now in a condition, taking the sum of its moral and material state, to count far more on the side of the Government—if fairly and considerably

treated by it—than it ever was. Let it be borne in mind that this region is one of the finest in the world—that in territorial extent it embraces a third of the slave States, and contains nearly half of the white population of them all, and constitutes a vast border between all the remaining slave States, and all the free States—and enlightened men will probably agree, that so far is it from being unreasonable to expect a wise government to be deeply considerate of the interests, the feelings, and the rights of such a population, so situated—it is worth all this war may cost to have wrested these five States from the grasp of the insurgents, and bound them more firmly than ever to the Union.

Throughout the entire free States, the war, instead of bringing with it unusual suffering and embarrassment, has been attended with a remarkable degree of prosperity. Great changes have, of course, occurred; but they have been made with wonderful facility, and been attended with great compensations. Certain losses, too, have fallen upon particular interests; but even these suffering interests have not been without special compensations. The shipping interest, for example, could not fail to suffer in the loss of the carrying trade, and of vessels captured—in both particulars through pirate expeditions, fitted out in Great Britain for the rebels. But the constant demand of the Government for vessels, chartered and purchased at enormous rates, has been probably more than a full compensation. In like manner, the commerce of the country might have been expected to suffer very greatly; and, no doubt, has suffered in certain respects; as, for example, by the sudden stoppage of the export of its chief staple—cotton. But this great loss was almost entirely compensated to the North by the vast increase in other articles of export—among the rest, one which diffused its benefits most widely of all—breadstuffs; while the actual loss from the stoppage of cotton fell mainly and terribly upon the insurgents themselves, and upon Great Britain and France; and while the United States were obliged to turn whatever loss fell upon them to great advantage, by diminishing imports for luxury, and by putting foreign trade upon a basis, at once sounder in itself and better for the United States. In some

respects, enormous advantages have been obtained; as, for example, by giving to the loyal States a monopoly of the tobacco trade of the world, as nearly as the cotton States had of that staple before the war began. And so we might enumerate special apparent injuries substantially compensated, and to a great degree by unforeseen results, throughout every material interest of the States of the North. The direct material advantages which have resulted from the war, and in many instances been actually produced by it, are very remarkable. As a very obvious instance, we may note the effect of the enormous increase of transportation, created by the war, upon the whole railroad system of the loyal States, in giving unprecedented prosperity and efficiency to a class of public works of the most vital importance to the nation, and in which more than a thousand millions of private wealth are embarked. Nor has any lesson of the war been more decisive, or more important for the country to cherish, than that concerning the military uses of these great works. These somewhat desultory statements and illustrations might be easily carried through every department of material interest and industrial occupation, relevant to the condition of a country in a state of war, as prosperous or otherwise, and the sum of the whole would confirm the indications of each particular example we have stated by way of illustration. Indeed, not only is the whole North in a state of great material prosperity in every particular needful to fit a country for the vigorous prosecution of war, but in nearly all the higher departments of the material service of war, the highest mechanical skill, the most active inventive genius, and the best attainments in many sciences, have been made tributary to the military power of the country. It is hardly too much to say, that the United States are competent, after all the great destruction of men, and of all the materials of war, to put into the field, and sustain there, an army as numerous as has ever been mustered in modern times, and better armed, provided, and paid, than any other army in the world. And no one in America doubts that it would do its work effectually when put to it. All this seems to be an incredible mystery to other nations. It will be well for them, however, to act as if they believed it all; and

not amiss for them to make such changes in their own condition, as will enable them to do the like as often as may be necessary.

It remains, as a part of this general topic, to speak of the monetary condition of the country, in comparison with that of the insurgents, as thus far affected by the war, and as affording an adequate basis for its further prosecution. The original reliance of the Confederate Government for the expenses of the war they provoked, with a degree of folly equaled only by their wickedness—if, indeed, they condescended to take thought of a subject so entirely beneath the exalted sphere to which their childish passions had carried them—seems to have been upon the fact, that their country being the chief producer of cotton for the great manufacturing and commercial nations of Western Europe, the cotton and those nations, working together in some unknown manner, would either produce as much money as might be wanted, or would give victory to the insurrection before any money would be wanted beyond what they could plunder from the sub-treasuries, custom houses, and post offices of the United States, and rob from all non-resident creditors and claimants of property by indiscriminate confiscation. Of course, every sensible and honest man knew before-hand, that theories and practices of this sort must produce—what all saw them speedily produce—very little money, still less chance of success, and very great disappointment and infamy. They then laid an *export* duty on cotton; although one pretext of the insurrection was to get rid of an *import* duty on fabrics of cotton; and although the surest result of the war was the blockade of their ports. They then undertook to rob every cotton planter of one half of his cotton, under pretext of purchase at a fixed rate to be paid in some sort of Confederate State credit; the whole to be held at the risk of the planter, till the government could sell the whole and pay the planter for the half left to him—at what rate we do not certainly know, but probably at the original rate, leaving the government all the advance. One small, and apparently unforeseen difficulty—namely, the blockade of their ports—defeated, in a great degree, this enormous scheme of plunder; and, in the end, it is probable that far the greater part of the cotton was burned by order of the Confederate Government, while the culture of it, except for family use, has been prohibited by law. After this

followed a system of taxation in kind, by which the government took for its own use one tenth part of the chief productions of the earth; and a system of sumptuary laws forbidding traffic by any medium of value but Confederate scrip, and fixing the value of the necessaries of life at a less price than the cost of producing them. To all this ruin we are to add a public debt, consisting, *first*, of a currency of many hundreds of millions, worth now about six cents to the dollar; *secondly*, of many hundreds of millions more of Confederate Domestic Bonds; and, *thirdly*, of Foreign Bonds to an unknown extent, for the redemption of which the cotton (now probably burned), was pledged. We are not accurately informed concerning the product of the ordinary taxes; or whether, according to the interpretation of their new institutions, direct taxes are laid by the central government. It is known generally that an effort was made to get the States in their separate capacity to guarantee the payment of the public debt, and that the effort failed. Forced loans is the only expedient left. The utter hopelessness of the financial condition of the Confederate Government and country, which the foregoing facts reveal, is rendered permanent and irremediable, while the causes now at work continue to operate, by the universal destruction of every source of individual prosperity, and the constantly increasing extent and pressure of personal want. Since the beginning of the world, we seriously doubt if a region so large and so prosperous was ever more speedily reduced to such a condition; or whether the share of the Confederate rulers, in producing such misery and ruin by their utter want of sense, of knowledge, and of integrity, was ever exceeded by any rulers in this world.

The course of the Federal Government has been, in all financial respects, signally the reverse of that pursued by the insurgents; and the result thus far has been, to secure to the United States a position of great strength, from which she is ready to proceed to whatever work is required of her. It was, of course, seen at once, that the public credit would be obliged to be used to a degree, very nearly proportionate to the cost of the war. The financial problem, therefore, was to use this credit in such a manner, as to disturb in the least possible degree the ordinary finances of the country; to keep the credit itself as nearly as possible at par; to keep the interest on the part used

as low as possible, and to make the credit, if it should become very large, a desirable mode of permanent investment. The plan adopted was extremely simple; as all effective conceptions are sure to be. The Government undertook to supply the country with a paper currency—which, to the whole extent of it, was an exhibition of public credit, for which the Government paid no interest; and by making which a legal tender, it could be kept as nearly at par—if properly managed afterwards—as it was possible to keep any currency not immediately convertible into the precious metals. It added to the value of this currency, that it was always convertible—and has been converted to an enormous amount—into national bonds, the interest on which was payable in coin; thus making the currency, by a short circuit, produce to its holders interest in coin; and making its reissue, after it was paid in for bonds, safely keep up the volume of public credit, that bore no interest. The coin to pay the interest on the bonds was to be raised from the foreign commerce of the country, the duties on imposts being made payable in coin; and the whole paper currency was made finally redeemable in coin. In the mean time, internal taxes—payable in legal tender notes—were laid upon principles which generally commend themselves to those most competent to judge. We are not possessed of the means of approximating the annual average product either of the taxes, or the imposts during the war. Suppose them to produce, year by year, one hundred millions from the taxes, and sixty millions from the imposts; and the cost of the war each year to be five hundred millions; the result of five years' war would be a public expenditure, of which the taxes having paid a hundred millions a year, and the imposts having paid the larger part of the interest in arrears; there would remain about two thousand millions, as a public debt; of which about five hundred millions would be in national currency, bearing no interest. To pay this debt (which would be about half as large as that of Great Britain), the United States, besides all its other resources, own public lands, altogether sufficient to do so; if Congress could be induced to take some care of that enormous national domain, instead of frittering it away on

some doubtful and many useless projects, and scandalous jobs, as it has done of late years.

We have made no allusion to the National Bank System, lately established on the basis of the national bonds; nor to certain financial operations of the Treasury Department, which seem to have been temporary. The currency to be issued by these national banks, is a national currency; though, as we understand, it is not a legal tender. As it is represented by an amount of national bonds, ten per cent greater than itself, deposited by the banks in the National Treasury, and upon which the banks receive interest; it would appear that the scheme might be beneficial to the national credit, by keeping up the price of bonds, and taking a large amount of them out of the market; and beneficial to the new banks, by their receiving interest on the bonds they deposit, and banking on the notes they receive in lieu of the bonds, and in other ways. The notes having the guaranty of the nation, must be ultimately good, and the nation apparently safe, as it holds its own bonds deposited in place of the notes issued. This depends somewhat on the way in which the bonds came to be deposited; that is, whether they were purchased by other notes than the identical ones issued on them. As the old banks are taxed in their circulation, their deposits, their savings, and their dividends, all this must tend to their transfer into the new kind of bank, or to their winding up. In either event, the currency guaranteed by the United States would become the exclusive circulating paper of the country; and the result would be that the General Government would become the guarantor for the honest management of all banks of circulation, as well as for the whole paper they circulated. We confess we look with anxiety upon the probable working of the whole scheme. On the whole, we apprehend that the advantages proposed are too remote from the basis of all credit, coin; and that the national credit will not be benefitted by this appendage. Nor ought we to forget, for a moment, that any national system exclusively of credit, is liable to be attacked in every quarter (as for example, by the persistent speculation in gold), and is assailed incessantly, through every department of foreign commerce; while even if it were never assailed at

all, it requires extraordinary skill, prudence, and honesty to bring it safely through; especially in countries where the executive government is allowed as small latitude of discretion in times of financial trouble, as they are in all free countries. Every one can see that prices are everywhere adjusting themselves to the new state of things, which the war and our financial system have created. Every one would do well to bear in mind, that after the war is over, and our financial system restored to a pure metallic basis, there is to be another adjustment of prices, in the opposite direction. And, as all the money we are now spending in a manner so terribly lavish, has to be accounted for, some day, as cash, it is the part of a wise and honest government to coerce a rigid economy in every department of public expenditure; and to punish with exemplary severity, every willful departure from rectitude. The losses which have been sustained by the destruction of army supplies, in food, clothing, horses, mules, wagons, arms and ammunition—in a very great degree through the fault of military officers; and the cheats which have been put upon the government by the fraudulent execution of contracts, and the exorbitant charges made against it for every species of thing, probably already amount to a sum sufficient to pay the interest of the whole war debt, up to the present time. It is hard to say that a portion of the demoralization, proved by these statements, is not the product of the flood of currency which covers the country, and which has depreciated so seriously within a year. Nor does the eager and universal return to prompt payments, in all private transactions, at the moment that a universal system of public credit is initiated, leave any room to doubt, that the paper currency, national and bank, is already working the effects of excess in all directions.

One great element in the history, working, and final result of our national troubles, has been the unfriendly conduct of foreign nations, and especially of Great Britain and France. We have been obliged, therefore, to allude very frequently to this aspect of the case, and, not long since, devoted an entire article to it.* The view we then presented was, in substance,

* See Danville Review for June, 1863, pp. 217-254.

that those two great nations were acting in concert with reference to this country; that the government and the dominant class in both of them, desired the humiliation and partition of the United States; that both nations were doing all that could be done, consistently with preserving even an appearance of neutrality, to favor the insurgents, and that both would do whatever more was necessary, even to a war of conquest, to secure the object they desired, if they should believe they could do it without too great danger to themselves. We then endeavored to point out, in the state of European affairs existing at that time, many sources of danger to Great Britain and France, in case they should make any attempt, by open war, upon us; and to prove that the United States were in a position to do them full as much damage as they could do us, and that our real security for peace with them, lay in making them understand that this was really so, and that we were fully resolved, if they made it necessary, to risk every thing upon it. The lapse of the half year which has followed that publication, has confirmed us in the justice of the statements then made, as applicable to the state of things then existing. The rapid march of events has put a new aspect on many things, both in Europe and America. The posture of all the great European nations, is more distinct than it then was; and the great events which have occurred in America, have so lifted the clouds, that the same line of policy which prevented European statesmen from discerning the course of American affairs, might now prevent them from being blind. And yet our danger might be as great from too much trust of the foreigner to-day, as from too much distrust of ourselves six months ago. What we now propose is, accepting as true and just what we have heretofore said on this general subject, to illustrate the bearing of several striking recent occurrences, exterior to us, upon the immediate security of the United States, from armed intervention by foreign states; and upon our true course in making the best of the present respite from that danger.

The most menacing of these events to the United States, is the conquest of Mexico by the Emperor Louis Napoleon, and the erection, under his auspices, and in effect by his army, of an empire dependent on him, upon the ruins of the Mexi-

can Republic. The most obvious remark upon this proceeding—utterly atrocious in every aspect of it—is that it teaches every weak nation, that its liberty and independence are held at the sufferance of every strong one. This lesson comes with the greater emphasis, as it violates, thus far with impunity, that great sentiment of all modern civilized nations, upon which the peace of the world, and the security of all peoples, rest more firmly than upon any other foundation; namely, that all armed intervention of one nation with the internal affairs of another—especially all intervention for conquest—is so high a crime against human society, that every human being is interested in its summary punishment. It adds another shade to the enormity of the French proceedings against Mexico, that the great breach the emperor was committing, as a faithless tyrant, upon the most sacred rights of nations, was attended throughout by incessant breaches of personal honor and veracity as a man, perpetrated in every direction, and on all occasions. He solicited and secured, on false pretexts, the alliance of England and Spain, until the joint invasion by the three powers was made; and then he shook off England and Spain; leaving them no alternative but to fight him, or to withdraw their forces. He deceived the governments of England, Spain, and the United States, by the most flagrant untruths, continually reiterated, into the belief that he sought absolutely nothing in Mexico but the payment of certain debts; when he had already, in the very beginning, put the imperial crown of Mexico at the disposal of the Arch-duke Maximilian, of Austria. Nay, he had even earlier still, by the intrigues of Gen. Almonte and the Archbishop of Mexico, secured the adhesion of the church party in Mexico to his schemes of conquest, and the approval of them by the Pope; and the whole world now knows from his own dispatch to his general in Mexico—the present Marshal Forey—that the true object, as he avowed, for seizing and holding Mexico, was the protection of the Papal Latin race, against the encroachments of the Protestant Saxons of the United States. For our own part, we greatly doubt, whether he has told the truth a single time, amid his innumerable deceptions; or whether any statement ever made by him, affords any evidence of his real intentions.

.

We ventured in a former article, already referred to, to express the opinion that the true objects of his pursuit in Mexico, were cotton and the precious metals. We think his character—his past acts—and the interests of his empire, are the only guides we have to his future conduct; and we are so well satisfied with the truth of our first conjecture, that we will give expression to another. We think it is extremely probable that the French invasion of Mexico, was the result of an understanding with the Confederate Government; the Emperor being as badly deceived in the foundation of his projects, as he deceived all others in carrying them into execution. He was undoubtedly led to believe, that, by his aid, the Confederate States could be easily made independent; and then could be made doubly tributary to his mania for cotton and the precious metals, *first* by their surrendering Texas to him, as the price of their independence, and *secondly*, by interposing the immense territory of the new nation in alliance with him, between the United States, as they would remain, and his own American possessions. Our space does not allow us to develop the proofs on which this conjecture rests. We may, however, remind the reader, how perfectly such a plan accords with the necessities, both of the French and the insurgents, and with the temper and character of the rulers of both parties; and how perfectly the pretended indignation of the government at Richmond, and its ostentatious display, against some alleged intrigues of French consular agents in Virginia and Texas, and the protestations of insulted innocence on the part of the French, illustrate the characteristic and concerted perfidy of both governments.

The determined attitude of England and Spain, as soon as they discovered enough of the schemes of the French Emperor to see that they had been betrayed throughout, left him no alternative but to press, with more ostentation, the previously concerted trick and deceit about an imperial crown for the Arch-duke Maximilian; and to conceal more carefully, for the moment, his real designs. Wise and gallant men will hardly be satisfied, that England and Spain went far enough, in merely withdrawing from the French alliance in Mexico, when they saw that they had been perfidiously made accessory to the most

enormous crime, and that this had been brought about by unbounded and insulting bad faith and profligate deceit, upon a question which England and Spain professed to believe involved at once their honor,—the peace of Europe—and the interests of all States. No high-spirited man would allow a coarse and unscrupulous one to insult and betray him after this fashion, with impunity; and no just man would stop short of preventing the gross injury to others, which he had been thus seduced by unmitigated baseness, into making not only possible, but in a certain sense respectable. England and Spain owed it to themselves, they owed it to Mexico, they owed it to the common interests of mankind—when they saw it to be their duty to withdraw, as they did from the French alliance in Mexico, to place the people of that country, with respect to France, in as good a condition as they were in before the alliance had secured their invasion. That England did not do this—which every high impulse of the nation would have prompted—is a melancholy proof of the extent to which she has humiliated herself, rather than have an open rupture with France; and is, moreover, a new and striking illustration of the interest which every nation in the world has, in the rupture of these relations between England and France, by means of which every part of the earth is successively disturbed and endangered. We must not suppose, however, that England easily digests such treatment, or speedily forgets it. Of course, she now understands, if she never did before, that no faith whatever can be put in the Emperor of the French—either as a man, an ally, or a ruler; and, unless we greatly mistake, this lawless man will have to get out of this Mexican adventure, without any sympathy or aid from England, and will not probably be allowed, without serious opposition from her, ultimately to make much more out of it, than he solemnly assured her he designed.

So far as the United States are concerned, our rapid conquest of the rebels opened the eyes of the emperor, and forced him to pause, or take the whole burden of their war. He had deceived our cabinet as completely as he had those of England and Spain; still, however, there could be no delusion, after the withdrawal of the English and Spanish from the French alliance in Mexico. Our existence was at stake, and the time for us to strike was come. Aid to the amount of forty or fifty millions to the

Mexican government at that moment, and a column of fifty thousand American volunteers, sent pretty nearly by the old routes of Gen. Taylor and Col. Doniphan; or even a distinct declaration to the French Emperor that he could not occupy Mexico, except upon the terms which he had just forfeited to England and Spain, would, as it appears to us, have been the course which, above all others, the interests of the United States required us to adopt. We think the French Emperor expected it, and that it would have been crowned with complete success. It would have led to a much earlier and more effectual conquest of our Southern insurgents, and would have cut short the entire project of the French in America; projects which, in that case and at that time, France could not longer have attempted to execute, without the imminent risk of being overwhelmed in a European war. Moreover, it would have put the United States, at once, at the head of a confederacy of American republics which would have given her and all the rest invincible strength, and isolated completely, and for all time, our insurgent States. It is possible such a course might have led to immediate war with France. But it is certain the success of France, unopposed by us, would have already led to war with her but for circumstances, with many of which our diplomacy could have had no connexion; as, for example, the unexpected resistance offered by the Mexicans, the remarkable success of our own military operations, the sudden exhaustion exhibited by our insurgents, the menacing position assumed by Russia, in repelling the insolence of France, and the coldness both of England and Austria in supporting the pretensions of France, both in Europe and America. We have allowed France to conquer Mexico, to send there a veteran army of fifty thousand Frenchmen, and to fill the Mexican waters with French ships-of-war. What can all that mean but war? And who can point out any way by which we can avoid war, if the French Emperor is resolved to pursue the projects he has avowed, those much more serious his conduct indicates, or those he has commenced executing? Or can any one suggest any important circumstance which could be added to the situation we have quietly allowed to come to its present pass, so as to put us, in case of war with France, in a condition much more disadvantageous than the one we actually occupy? It is understood that the Minister of the United States in Mexico does not

recognize the government set up by the French army, and it is known that the President of the United States has lately recognized a minister to this country from the old Juarez government. It is no doubt certain that negotiations have been on foot, by which the French Emperor proposed to make his provisional government in Mexico recognize the independence of our Confederate Government as soon as it had recognized his in Mexico. In the mean time the Juarez government keeps the field, and the Mexican people will, to a certain extent, and perhaps to the whole extent of the liberal party, support it and fight for it; without avail, we should suppose, except so far as to keep up protracted bloodshed. In Europe, the farce with the Arch duke Maximilian awaits the popular vote for him in Mexico, which the French will, of course, return in a manner intended to be satisfactory to him; and awaits in Europe, loans of money, and guaranties of the stability of his new throne, both of which he will get, or fail to get, according as Louis Napoleon shall happen to think, at the time, is best for his own ultimate designs. Amidst all these elements of apparent confusion, the French Emperor takes, or appears to take, two apparently decided steps towards peace with the United States. He promptly stops, or appears to stop, the building of war vessels for our insurgents; and he refuses, or pretends to refuse, any change whatever in what he calls his settled policy of neutrality, and non-recognition of our rebels as any thing more than belligerents. What, then, is the sense of all this? As regards Louis Napoleon, this: that his great power, and total want of principle, make him the most dangerous man in the world. As regards ourselves, this: that, having let slip the golden opportunity to save Mexico, foil Louis Napoleon, and acquire for ourselves a position of vastly increased strength, what is left to us is, to convince the Emperor it exceeds his power to make our rebels a nation; to be ready to fight him, to the last extremity, whenever it may suit him to require us to do so, on that quarrel; and to use the innumerable opportunities of diplomacy, and the vehement march of events over all the world, in a manner so skillful, that he will find no opportunity of attacking us without greater danger to himself than to us. Mean time, the quicker we subdue our own insurgents, the more readily will the Emperor of the French keep the peace with us. Of course he can not get any cotton land or

gold land from us. Of course, in the long run, the French can not hold Mexico permanently; nor can any one, much less any European royal family reign long there. The Emperor of the French has committed a mistake in invading Mexico, which he may so manage as to make it fatal. It was a just retribution, that he who habitually deceives others, should have been deceived by the American rebels, into a scheme vast enough to endanger his throne, and destitute of any fair prospect of permanent advantage. It is a humiliation to us, that God had not given us wisdom to use the great occasion, as was fit. But in another way it may work out immense results, many of which may be turned to our great advantage.

Events of an unexpected character have also occurred in Great Britain, which indicate a considerable change in the temper of the Government towards the United States; and the malignant condition of popular opinion there, towards the American people, which has been so marked and so insulting, seems to be giving place to a new and increasing impulse, favorable to us. It is extremely difficult to tell, how much reliance is to be placed on such appearances, either as to the real purposes of the Government, or the ruling sentiments of the people of Great Britain; nor is it easy to conjecture, before hand, to what acts those purposes and sentiments may lead—nor what may be the importance of those acts to us, after they are performed. We have received deep wrong from the English government—have endured boundless indignities from the English press and people. The first act of that powerful nation was in the nature of a hostile warning. Availing herself of an insurrection among our people, she suddenly changed her position from that of a friendly power, to that of a neutral between us and the insurgent population of our Southern States; and in order to make that hostile change, reduced the American nation to the same level with its rebellious citizens, calling both *belligerents*. From that moment, the attitude of England, and the whole aspect of her policy, has been a perpetual menace to the United States—a perpetual trouble and obstruction to us. And during all the time, the English government, keeping just short of war with us, and of such acts as would oblige the American government to declare war upon her; has connived at every species of hostile

conduct towards us, on the part of British subjects of all grades and employments; producing, in effect, a state of things nearly as advantageous to the insurgents as the acknowledgment of their independence would have been, and hardly as desirable for us as a state of actual war would have been. It is not too much to say, that but for the course of England, the insurgents would have been put down with one-half of the cost and bloodshed that have already taken place; and no one in America doubts that England would have secured the triumph of the insurgents if she could have done so by the policy she first adopted, or even by open war, the successful and advantageous termination of which was reasonably certain. But the vast strength exhibited by the United States, their invincible determination to put down the insurrection, the steady success of their arms, and the increasing vigor of their diplomacy, were sufficient to satisfy England—and, we suppose, did satisfy her—that no aid she could give the rebels, short of actual war, would secure their success, and that there was extreme doubt whether a third war waged by her against the United States, would be more successful or advantageous to her than the other two had been. There were, no doubt, other considerations, of the very highest importance, of which we will speak presently, which may have had even preponderating weight with English statesmen, showing that the friendship of the United States might become far more important to England, than the humiliation or even the destruction of the great Republic. In the meantime, it was impossible to restrain the hostile and constantly aggressive nature of what England called her *neutrality*, within bounds that the United States would endure, or that England could permit to be transgressed, without making precedents which England, as the first maritime nation in the world, would find more hurtful to herself than to any other nation. It came simply and clearly to be decided, whether England would permit hostile expeditions against the United States, in favor of the Confederate States, to be fitted out in her ports and harbors; and whether, if she persisted in allowing this direct act of war against us, our government would hold her to the consequences and commence war against her. The public are not in possession of the correspondence between the two governments on the subject. It would ap-

pear, however, that the British Government was at first and for some time inclined to evade the issue, to extenuate the conduct of her subjects, and to give small satisfaction to the American Government. Finally, however, that Government met the matter with energy, seized certain vessels of war when they were nearly ready to sail, professed its conviction that the matters alleged were violations of British neutrality, and avowed its purpose to prevent them. Besides this, Lord Russell and the Attorney-General, in public speeches apparently made for the purpose, and apparently also speaking in the name of the Government, avowed the principle that the recognition of the independence of a new nation was not a means to an end, but the recognition of an existing fact; acknowledged that no such fact existed in the case of the Confederate States, and declared that England would never recognize that the fact existed while it did not exist. Undoubtedly these are events of great importance; undoubtedly, if the British Government has avowed itself candidly, holding back no sinister purpose, the relations between it and the Government of the United States occupy a more satisfactory basis, than anything in the events of the two preceding years would have allowed us to anticipate. From our point of view it is tantamount to a radical change of the British view of British interests, as connected with the issues of the civil war in America; and indicates very plainly the possibility of considerable changes in the future attitude of England, on many questions of very great importance. At the very least it gives us additional time in which, without serious disturbance from abroad, we may subdue the insurgents and be better prepared for whatever the future may bring forth.

The British Government would probably insist, that no motive existed for the part it acted in the matter just explained, except the desire to do what was proper in the circumstances. They, however, who have not found purity and honor the constant rule of conduct with all human governments, are apt to feel somewhat more assured, when they can discover in the *circumstances* attending even the most commendable public acts, substantial worldly reasons for them. We are the more content with the recent conduct of Great Britain, when we can well persuade ourself, that something in the actual position of the American *belligerents*, and something in the violent probab-

ities of the sort of end to which the American war seems rapidly tending, and something in the threatening aspect of the possible war between Great Britain and the United States; may have been a part of those *circumstances*, under which it was proper to do the right and just thing, that was done. We admit, further, that it would add to our content, if we could feel assured, that other *circumstances* in which that right doing was not only proper, but eminently wise, stand very closely connected, on one side with the cordial understanding, if we may not call it an alliance, between France and England, which is a standing menace to all nations; and on another side, with the disturbed and threatening condition of so many vast European interests; and on another side still, with many great principles of public European law, and with many great rules of national and even human rights, in support of which Britain has been privy to the shedding of so much blood, and in vindicating which she may soon be called to shed her own once more. Yea, greatly content would we be, to be allowed to believe that England has changed her thought, and would like to stand closer by America, when the storm which all thoughtful men see rising over Europe, shall burst! Nor would it take any thing from our confidence that England will adhere to the line of conduct towards America, which appears to us to be new, even if we could be assured that the personal treatment of her by the Emperor of the French, in the Mexican invasion, rankled in her proud heart, when she determined not to fight us for the privilege of sending out hostile expeditions from neutral ports against friendly nations. Nay, if we did but know that she would apply to this Mexican outrage of Louis Napoleon, her cherished doctrine of national freedom, and non-intervention; and would apply to this great public deceiver, and pitiless usurper, any test by which any English gentleman would regulate his conduct towards any perfectly faithless, and utterly flagitious disturber of private life; we should feel much better satisfied, that the future conduct of England towards the United States, will be such as we can safely or properly endure. We can not, at the least, avoid the hope, that the existing state of affairs both in Europe and America, and the terrible shadow thrown across the cordial understanding between France and England, by the shocking and dangerous disclosure of himself, made by the Emperor of the French, in

his Mexican expedition ; have given England considerable light upon many pending questions, relating to the rights and duties of belligerents and of neutrals.

Under these circumstances, we hope England will have no difficulty in satisfying the United States, with regard to the fitting out of hostile expeditions against us from Canada, the first of which, upon a considerable scale, has exploded prematurely, since we commenced the preparation of this article. We do not see it to be at all surprising, that they who were habitually allowed to use the whole of Great Britain, to furnish themselves in every way, with every thing contraband of war, even to the extent of fitting and sending out hostile expeditions against us ; and who have been protected,—we should rather say caressed,—in the use of British Islands situate at our very doors, as entrepôts to which contraband goods were brought in British ships, to be smuggled into our blockaded ports in other British built and British owned ships ; should not hesitate to use the British ports and possessions along our northern frontier, just as they used the rest of the British ports and possessions, to carry on war against the United States.

We do, however, see much that is astonishing in the want of foresight, on the part of our Government, in making these British possessions, adjacent to us, a place of forcible, or even discretionary, exile for great multitudes of our traitors ; and not less, in the quiet unconcern with which tens of thousands of them were allowed to flock there, at their own discretion, without the remotest idea, apparently, on the part of our Government, of any danger, or the slightest attempt to discover any that might be hatched, and provide against it. As far as appears, the Confederate Government organized a military expedition, by sea and through the Canadas, to assist a much more powerful one organized in Canada West—the object of the whole being to operate piratically from the Canadian shore of Lake Erie, against the vast American commerce on that lake, the American islands in its southern waters—one of which was occupied by several thousand prisoners of war—and the American cities on its shores, many of which are among the richest and most prosperous cities on the American Continent. It seems that our Government received the first

knowledge of this audacious expedition, on the very eve of its setting forth from Canada West, from the British Minister at Washington, who was informed of it by the British Mayor of Montreal. The deliberate violations of the laws and the neutrality of Great Britain in this flagrant manner—*first*, by the Confederate Government; and, *secondly*, by the American exiles and refugees in Canada; and, *thirdly*, probably, by Canadian sharers in the villainy—are offenses against Great Britain herself, in the first instance, which she might deal with, as for her own satisfaction, as she pleased. But, in the second instance, they concern so intimately the peace and security of the United States, that if, upon the requisition of our Government, Great Britain neglects to deal with them, to our reasonable satisfaction, she thereby becomes responsible for them herself, and we will, if we see fit, take redress into our own hands. Our existing treaties with Great Britain forbid us, it is said, to keep an adequate armed force in commission on Lake Erie; which, if it be true, additionally obliges the Governments of both Canada and Great Britain to prevent effectually any more disturbance from Canada. The whole case is, in principle, just the same as the one lately come to a head, concerning rebel vessels of war in England, which we have already explained—only this Canadian case is on a much larger scale, is more clearly a violation of British territory, and is more immediately dangerous to us. We need say no more about it in its present stage, than that if Great Britain does not keep Canada from being either a way or a means of disturbing us, other ways of doing it would be very speedily found. If the American refugees in Canada West have not lost all sense, they will probably understand that they have already done enough, to make another and early change of residence prudent.

We have already said that the sudden recognition of the insurgents, as belligerents, by Great Britain and France (which both have failed to do, as yet, for the Polish insurgents) was an unfriendly act. From that moment, the United States had everything to apprehend from both of those nations. And to the present time—except the recent seizure, in both of them, of the rebel ships of war, and the recent

declaration, on the part of both of them, that the rebels could obtain from them no present recognition of independence—nothing has occurred, so far as the public knows, that justifies us in expecting, with confidence, from those nations, more than they believe it would be perilous for them to withhold. We have discussed, as fully as our limits would permit, both of those acts on the part of both of those nations. But there is another of the great nations of Europe—Russia—between whom and the United States, no relations, except the most friendly, have ever existed; whose friendship has been openly avowed during all our recent difficulties; and whose present attitude, with reference to the other great powers of Europe, especially toward France, has hitherto tended much to our advantage, in an indirect manner, and now operates to secure to us further time to bring our domestic war to a successful close. It is certain, we suppose, that the French conquest of Mexico would not have occurred, but for the preceding insurrection in the United States; and it is, we suppose, nearly as certain that France and England would have attempted to coerce the partition of the United States, but for the premature explosion of the Polish revolt, which, there is no doubt, was concerted in France; and the defiant attitude of the Emperor Alexander toward Austria, England, and especially France, with reference to it. It is marvelous to reflect on the boundless faith in human credulity, and the fathomless hypocrisy of tyrants, when one hears the Emperor of the French *talk* about Polish independence, and the sanctity of promises, and sees him *act* in the Mexican invasion! As for us, if we have been put to loss and danger, by means of certain European movements on one side, we have also derived great advantages from other European movements in another direction. And as for the great doctrine of non-intervention, upon which the independence of nations rests, if it has been trodden under foot in Mexico, as a consequence of the alliance of England, France, and Spain, and the combined perfidy and violence of the Emperor of the French; on the other hand it has found the Emperor of Russia repelling the attempts of France, England, and Austria, in the case of Poland, to the verge of a European war; and the United States ready to

stake its existence, in its support, against the combined power of France, England, and the American insurgents. It is striking to observe that all the time it is France and England combined, and then follows trouble: sometimes with Austria, sometimes with Spain, sometimes with Sardinia and Turkey, sometimes those two only — but always France and England, and always aggression, menace, and peril to nations, when they unite. No combination of nations of the second class is able to oppose them successfully. It is a high instinct of safety, as well as the result of supreme statesmanship, that in the present state of the world, this vast combination in the center, can be kept in check by only the mutual coöperation of the great powers on its flanks. As long as England will combine with France to menace and rob nations, she will see that she more and more consolidates the good understanding between America and Russia. The working of this problem has commenced under the misdoings of England. The immediate solution of it would be, for England to get rid of her French mania and terror, and conciliate the United States. If wrought out as France has started it, its solution belongs to posterity.

To a certain extent both England and Austria are understood to have drawn back from the lead of France, on the Polish question; just as England and Spain drew back from the lead of France, on the Mexican question. That is, neither Austria nor England will commit herself to anything, the eventuality of which means war, on that question. It is also understood to be the avowed conviction of the Emperor of the French, that nothing but a European Congress, can prevent a general war in Europe, connected with that question. And he is thought to be acting on that conviction. But it is very obvious, that nothing but the independence of all Poland, as she stood before the first partition of 1772,—or the total absorption of Polish nationality, can give permanent relief from Polish agitation. The latter is well nigh, if not utterly, impossible in itself. The former is hopelessly impossible, as a sacrifice to be expected from Russia, or any other great nation; just as much so, as the restored independence of Ireland, by the consent of England. Indeed, more so, for by that means, Russia, at present the greatest power in

Europe, would be virtually shut out of the pale of European powers, and become essentially an Asiatic nation. And this contemplated European Congress under the lead of the Emperor Napoleon, finding the Emperor Alexander thoroughly intractable as to the interpretations put by the other great powers, upon the treaty of Vienna, which contains the only European recognition of any title in Russia, to any part of Poland; could only break up as a failure, or by another European act, cancel the former recognition of the Russian title, and begin a war that would probably last a century. The grand folly has been, for Europe to attempt to preserve the nationality of the Poles, without preserving the independence of Poland. We see before us the issue of such an experiment, after ninety years of inconceivable crime and misery. And now the Emperor Alexander, with his title of original conquest, and ninety years of holding, and European recognition when Europe had destroyed the first Napoleon; is hardly likely to be very seriously alarmed for his title, by the menaces of the Napoleon now reigning. The best commentary on his intentions, yet made public, is probably his fleet wintering on our coast, to avoid being frozen up in the Baltic during this critical winter. Now it is impossible for us to enter here into the merits of those vast questions. If we have succeeded in suggesting to our readers, in this, as in the preceding cases, some chief grounds of our convictions, or our conjectures; we have done all we could expect towards explaining our hope, that America, in her great trouble, is to be helped by the troubles both of her European friends and enemies. The state of Europe, produced by the Polish revolution, does not appear to us, to leave either France or England in a position, *just now*, to risk war with the United States, in aid of our insurgents; nor does the position of Russia allow her, to consent willingly to the destruction of the United States, in case that attempt is made. We reiterate, therefore, let us seize the respite, and subdue the insurgents.

It has not occurred, in the course of this paper, to speak separately of the great military operations, on land, much less to criticise any particular portion of them; nor to make separate mention of our powerful and rapidly increasing navy, nor of the enormous and constantly recurring injuries inflicted on our commerce by piratical vessels, built, fitted out, and virtually

owned in England, and roaming the high seas under a flag recognized as national, by no nation in the world. Of the increase of our marine force, some idea may be formed, from the single fact that the fleet on the Mississippi and its tributaries, is said to have increased, within two years, from three vessels and about five hundred men, to a hundred vessels and many thousand men. We can not prolong this article, however, by entering now upon additional questions, of such extent and importance. Nor is it gracious, or quite appropriate, to close it with expressions of regret and disappointment. We have made it plain, we think, that an immense work has been done, and that the nation is able and resolved to finish it. We could make it quite as plain, we suppose, that the nation is restless at the delay, which it justly apprehends is not to be accounted for, by any shortcoming on its part, or any thing in the nature or extent of the work itself, when compared with the enormous force, preparation, and expense lavished on it. No degree of skill, courage or activity on the part of the insurgents, ought to exceed that on our own part; and certainly if that be so, the long delay in subduing them on land, and sweeping their half dozen pirates from the high seas, has already reached the utmost limit that is creditable to the Government, or safe to those it has entrusted with the means of commanding success. The inquest of the Republic will be fierce, as well as terrible, when wearied with the exhortation, *Let us subdue the insurgents*,—it suddenly lifts up the stern cry, *Why have we not subdued the insurgents?* To betray, to stultify, to trifle, to seduce, to deceive, a great nation to dishonor and shame, are crimes never forgiven.

ART. VII.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Part I. Abraham to Samuel. By ARTHUR PENRYN STANLEY, D. D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. With Maps and Plans. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand Street. 1863.

DR. STANLEY has produced a work which combines uncommon excellences with marked defects. He is an accomplished historical scholar, has enjoyed the advantages of oriental travel, and possesses an imaginative and constructive mind: hence the excellences of these Lectures. He is, if so much may be said without offense, latitudinarian, or Broad Church, in his theology: hence their defects.

The celebrated French scholar, M. Renan, says of a visit which he made to Palestine: "The striking accords of the texts and the places, the marvelous harmony of the Gospel ideal with the country which served for its frame, were to me like a revelation. I had before my eyes a fifth Gospel, torn, but still legible, so that thence forward, through the medium of the narratives of Matthew and Mark, I have seen, instead of an abstract being, such as one would say never existed, a noble human figure, living and moving." The Holy Land made similar impressions on Dr. Stanley in relation to Old Testament history, and these impressions he has reproduced on his pages with a master's hand. The richest information, a true poetical genius, the widest sympathy with the past, and a power of vivid word-painting, contribute to the general effect. No other book, in the language, gives such reality to the scenes of sacred history, to the very persons and habits of its principal characters, to actual life in Egypt, in the wilderness and in the land of Canaan. The whole story, under his treatment, acquires the body and solidity of a real present experience.

M. Renan returned from Palestine to prepare a Life of Christ, in which the Master is represented as the grandest human being that ever appeared on earth, and nothing more; not divine, not superhuman, "either in mission or endowments." Dr. Stanley has not reached analogous conclusions respecting the Old Testament history; on the contrary, he accepts these scriptures as holding, within their compass, supernatural revelation, and concedes to Abraham, at least, the possession of a supernatural call. But he reduces both inspiration and the natural, too often, to their lowest terms. For example, he rejects the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Old Testament. "There may be," he says, "errors in chronology,—exaggerations in numbers—contradictions be-

tween the different narratives. These may compel us to relinquish one or other of the numerous hypotheses which have been formed respecting the composition or the inspiration of the Old Testament. But as they would not destroy the value of other history, so they need not destroy the value of this history, because it relates to sacred subjects; or prevent us from making the very most of those portions of it which are undeniably historical;" etc. (*Introd.* xl.) Again, in a note, at the end of the volume, he says that the arithmetical errors which have been pointed out in the narrative of the Old Testament "are unquestionably inconsistent with the popular hypothesis of the uniform and undeviating accuracy of the Biblical History." He then gravely proposes a critical procedure, by which the "incredibility of one part of the narrative" of the exodus "becomes a direct argument in favor of the probability of the rest;" and suggests still further that we should extend to different parts of the Old Testament "the same laws of criticism which we apply to other histories, especially to Oriental histories." When it is remembered how large the allowance which must be made for the exaggerations and extravagances of "Oriental history" the rule is seen to be "broad" enough for Colenso, or even Ewald himself.

After the same example (*sit venia verbo*) of unbelief, he deals with the miracles of the Pentateuch: reducing them to the minimum. In treating of the ten plagues inflicted on Egypt, he speaks vaguely of the "proportion in which the natural and supernatural are mingled" (p. 131); and describes them as "the interventions of a Power above the power of man" (p. 132). But it is hard to tell whether he regards them as *miracula* or as *mirabilia* only; as true miracles or as remarkable interpositions of the Almighty, in the way of an overruling Providence. Whether, again, 600,000 armed men, according to Moses, or 600 armed men, according to Laborde, left Egypt, Dr. Stanley leaves "to the critical analysis of the text and the probabilities of the case." (p. 137.) He is equally cautious in committing himself on the question of the miraculous, in the passage of the Red Sea. It is one of those occasions on which "deliverance is brought about not by any human energy, but by causes beyond our own control. Such in Christian history, are the raising of the siege of Leyden and the overthrow of the Armada, and such above all was the passage of the Red Sea." (p. 145.) In the chapter on Israel in the Wilderness, he makes no mention of the Pillar of Cloud and of Fire, and so escapes the problem of the supernatural contained in that phenomenon. "In respect of the support of Israel in the wilderness, he observes that "we can not repudiate altogether the intervention of a Providence strange, unexpected and impressive in the highest degree, unless we are prepared to reject the whole story of the stay in the wilderness." (p. 161.) If the

author had qualified the word "Providence" with either of the adjectives "supernatural" or "miraculous" his statement would have lodged satisfaction, instead of doubt, as to his real sentiments, in the minds of some of his most thoughtful readers. In the graphic description which is given at pp. 256. 257, of the passage of the Jordan, the supernatural features of the transaction are fairly reproduced. But the author expresses with unusual confidence, the opinion that the arrest of the sun and moon, at the word of Joshua (x: 12) is to be taken in the popular and poetical sense, according to the "unanimous opinion of all German theologians of whatever school;" just as the expression "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera" is commonly understood. (p. 276, note.)

Nor is Dr. Stanley's treatment of Prophecy satisfactory. He divides the prophetic teaching into three parts, according to the three famous words of Bernard:—*Respice, Aspice, Prospice*; showing that the prophets were interpreters of the Divine Will respecting the past, the present and the future. The first two of these parts are well handled, but the third, or predictive character of the prophet, is dwarfed into narrow dimensions. He states that "the Hebrew prophets made predictions concerning the fortunes of their own and other countries, which were unquestionably fulfilled. There can be no reasonable doubt, for example, that Amos foretold the captivity and return of Israel; and Michael the fall of Samaria; and Ezekiel the fall of Jerusalem; and Isaiah the fall of Tyre; and Jeremiah the limits of the captivity." (p. 517.) The exception to which this catalogue of fulfilled prophecies is liable is this:—it does not recognize several of the same class which are, perhaps, more striking than any here mentioned; as, for example, the prediction of Moses respecting the dispersion of the Jews, the predictions respecting Egypt, Moab, Babylon, etc. Dr. Stanley, on another page, introduces the Messianic prophecies; but the reader is left in wonder how an accomplished scholar, a preacher of the gospel and a man of genius, could make so little out of the very grandest themes of the Old Testament Scriptures.

There is very little theology, or profound religious philosophy, in these Lectures. As notable instances of a failure to apprehend the primal laws according to which sacred history unfolds the divine idea, it may be mentioned, briefly, that although Dr. S. treats professedly of the *Jewish Church*, irrespective of the *Jewish State*, he does not trace the development, through the ages, of the plan of salvation; and he sinks the covenants nearly out of sight. He contemplates the covenant of circumcision with the eye of a poet, and makes no mention whatever of the covenant at Sinai. How can the history of the Jewish Church be explicated in neglect of its fundamental laws and constitutions?

Considered as a mere work of the historical art, the Lectures on the Judges are defective. They represent the period to have been one of commotion, incessant wars and anarchy; and a close analogy is taken between the Jewish Church in the period of the Judges, and the Christian Church in the middle ages. (pp. 343, 347.) This is no doubt the common impression, but it is incorrect. There were many wars, but then there were long intervals of peace. At three different times "the land had rest forty years." (Judges iii: 11, v: 31, viii: 28.) After the war with Moab the "land had rest eighty years" (iii: 30.) From Joshua to Samuel, four hundred and fifty years, only one hundred and fourteen years were disturbed by the heathen invasions. Again, these disturbances rarely affected, simultaneously, the entire country. The northern, or the eastern, or the western tribes, as the case might be, were invaded while the others were at peace; somewhat after the analogy of our own Indian wars. The great Philistine war, for example, under the regencies of Sampson and Samuel, raged among the western tribes; the war, during the regency of Jephthah, was confined to the region beyond the Jordan; and during the regency of Deborah a great battle was fought at Esdradon while "the bleatings of the flocks" were heard in Reuben. History usually devotes large spaces to wars, and dispatches with few words the many intervening years of peace; just as a description of the ocean deals more with its days of storm and shipwreck than its long, tranquil summers. Moreover, it was the plan of this part of sacred history to exhibit the sins of the people; their punishment by the instrumentality of the heathen, and their deliverance by the power of God. The troubles of the period are therefore made particularly prominent.

The volume, as a product of the arts of printing and binding, is nearly perfect. The paper, type, and general appearance of the book reflect the highest credit on the skill and taste of its enterprising publisher, Mr. Charles Scribner.

E. P. H.

The Presbyterian Historical Almanac and Annual Remembrancer of the Church for 1863. By JOSEPH M. WILSON. Volume V. Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson, No. 111 South Tenth street, below Chestnut street. 1863.

THIS Annual has now passed, it may be supposed, beyond the experimental stage, and become an established work—at least so long as Mr. Wilson's ability to issue it continues, for it is evidently a labor of love with him. And when he is laid aside, it is to be hoped some equally competent hand will take his place.

The present number is a stout octavo volume of five hundred pages of closely printed matter, requiring a vast amount of labor in its preparation. It contains not only quite a full account, with a few exceptions, of the acts, deliverances, and operations, for the past year, of the highest judicatories of the Presbyterian churches of the United States, Scotland, and British America, including the General Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch church of this country; but many valuable statistical tables, and a large body of pertinent miscellaneous matter. Included in the latter are the histories of seven churches of the Presbyterian family and of the Princeton Theological Seminary, with Dr. Sprague's discourse at the semi-centennial jubilee appended to the last; biographical sketches of more than one hundred ministers and ruling elders, mostly the former; and a second carefully digested article on Manses. There are also nineteen well-executed portraits of ministers more or less distinguished, five of whom remain unto this day, and several engravings of churches and institutions of learning. This statement, though by no means exhaustive of the contents of the volume, is enough to show that it is a store-house of interesting and valuable information. The work received, in 1862, the approbation of the General Assemblies of both branches of the Presbyterian church in the United States, of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian church, and of the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian church; and we observe, in a late paper, that the Synod of Baltimore, at its recent sessions in the city of Washington, commended it "as every way worthy of consideration and support." If, then, its own merits and the authority of these venerable courts can not secure a sufficient patronage for its permanent support, it will be strange indeed. Looking, however, at the completeness of the proceedings of the other bodies, one is somewhat surprised at the meager record of the Established and Free churches of Scotland.

The Biographical Sketches, especially of those who have recently fallen asleep, will be read with a very tender interest. Almost every one who takes up the Almanac, will meet with an outline of the life and labors of some dear friend with whom he had often taken sweet counsel and gone to the house of God in company, and from whose lips he had heard the word of the truth of the Gospel. Some will find graven by art and man's device, the face of a beloved pastor, or of a brother in the ministry, and as they gaze on that face will live over again the seasons of joy and of sorrow which they shared with him who has preceded them but a little in the passage over Jordan. Happy ones! they rest from their labors and their works do follow them. How many the attractions that draw us toward the home of the good and blessed! and how they increase as time rolls onward! Many a one can say, more are my friends beyond the flood than they who remain behind! Of the

dead whose memory is embalmed in these pages, some were known of the church as far as the English tongue is spoken; a few attained an enviable fame among the learned and pious of almost all Christian nations; more passed lives of great usefulness, toil, and self-sacrifice, in comparative obscurity. Among the number appears the name of Robert Steel, D. D., the venerated pastor and friend of the youth of him who writes these lines. No more appropriate text could have been selected for his funeral sermon than the one that was selected: "*He was a good man and a just.*" Full of works of faith and labors of love, his life on earth most fitly and gently ended as with his expiring breath he whispered, putting his hand on his heart, "*I have a peace here that passeth all understanding.*" It is a rare thing now for a man to die, as he did, in the midst of the people of his only charge, after a pastorate of forty-three years. The remembrance of him is as a sweet ointment poured forth.

Our readers will find in this volume what is accessible probably to very few of them in any other quarter; we mean an account of the organization and of the proceedings for 1861 and 1862, of the body styling itself the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the Confederate States of America. It appears that fifty-five ministers and thirty-eight ruling elders, ninety-three in all, commissioned by their respective presbyteries to convene at Augusta, Ga., Dec. 4th, 1861, did there and then constitute the first General Assembly. Dr. McFarland was appointed to preside until a regular organization was effected. After the roll of commissioners had been reported, Dr. B. M. Palmer was elected moderator, and Drs. Turner and Waddell, temporary clerks. The second Assembly met at Montgomery, Alabama, on May 1st, 1862. Thirty-one ministers and sixteen elders, a grand total of forty-seven commissioners, were reported and enrolled. Dr. J. L. Kirkpatrick was elected moderator, and Dr. McBryde temporary clerk. The Rev. Joseph R. Wilson, D. D., is permanent clerk, and the Rev. John M. Waddell, D. D., stated clerk of the Assembly. The third meeting was required to be held on May 7th, 1863, at Columbia, S. C., "or wheresoever else the Moderator of this Assembly may authorize the Stated and Permanent Clerks to convene it." The alternative here presented is rather significant. We are not sure any Assembly met the current year; but if it did, and the reduction in the representation was as great as from 1861 to 1862, the convocation at Columbia, or *elsewhere*, was a rather small assemblage of venerables. Moreover, as the brethren of the Assembly of '62 "distinctly recognize the right of the State to claim the services of any or all her citizens in this time of her need," the uncertainty touching a meeting in May, '63, is increased. Our old friends and compeers who should have met as a General Assembly of the

Presbyterian church in the *C. S. A.*, may have been gathered unto "the assemblies of violent men," there doing battle valiantly under the leadership of Lee or Bragg. But wherever they were or are, we love them personally, though we think they committed a great wrong in dividing the church at the time and in the manner they did. S. Y.

Health: Its Friends and its Foes. By R. D. MUSSEY, M. D., LL. D., late Professor of Anatomy and Surgery, at Dartmouth College. N. H., and of Surgery in the Medical College of Ohio; Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, etc., etc. Boston, Gould & Lincoln.

FEW men have a better right to be heard on the subject of health than the venerable author of this book. He is one of the most eminent physicians and surgeons in the country, and for thirty years, has been one of the most successful medical teachers in the East and the West. His health was feeble in his boyhood; having, as he says "inherited a dyspeptic stomach." Yet he has led a most laborious life, and now, in the eighty-fourth year of his age, has far more vigor, both of body and mind, than not a few men of fifty. He published this book in June, 1862, when he was 82 years old. Dr. Mussey is, and has been, for about thirty years, a vegetarian, eating neither meat nor fish, and drinking neither malt nor spirituous liquors, tea nor coffee. There will be a difference of opinion as to his views on those topics; but no reader will deny the cogency and modesty with which they are urged. Apart from these subjects, the book is filled with advice to valetudinarians drawn from the widest observation, great professional experience and a true philanthropy. The author has done a good service in delivering this book to the public; and it will add to many of those who read it profitably, comfortable health and length of days. E. P. H.

The Last Times and The Great Consummation: An Earnest Discussion of Momentous Themes. By JOSEPH A. SEISS, D. D., author of "The Gospel in Leviticus," "The Parable of the Ten Virgins," "The Day of the Lord," "Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews," &c., &c. Revised and enlarged edition. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 23, North Sixth Street. New York: Blakeman & Mason. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard. London: Wertheim, McIntosh & Hunt. Toronto: W. C. Chewett & Co. 1863. pp. 442.

THIS book, as its title imports, is a "revised and enlarged edition" of a work which has been before the public several years, having passed

through several editions. A former edition we have read with some care. That consisted of twelve lectures, delivered by the author to a Lutheran Church in Philadelphia, of which he is pastor. The present edition, besides these Lectures, contains one hundred and twenty pages of additional matter, consisting of copious notes and citations from a great number of authorities, ancient and modern, designed to elucidate and sustain the doctrines advanced in the Lectures, together with a long list of works recently issued from the press, in this country and in Europe, upon different branches of the general subject of which the Lectures treat. The author's style is in a great measure that of impassioned declamation, containing passages of real beauty, and sometimes rising to the point of great eloquence and power. This is not the best for evolving the truth, where a rigid exegesis is requisite, upon portions of Scripture severely contested. But the author blends the two with a good degree of success, for didactic and popular effect.

The general aim of the work, doctrinally considered, is that of maintaining the pre-millennial advent, and personal reign of Christ on earth, and the other doctrinal views of the system of which these are the central propositions. Dr. Seiss agrees in the main with David N. Lord, Esq., of New York, who may be regarded as one of the leaders in this country among those who advocate this theory. Mr. Lord's *Literary and Theological Journal*, which has been published some thirteen years, and several other volumes he has given to the public, exhibit the argument at length on which he relies. It is well known that this theory has been gaining ground, within twenty years or more, among the churches of England and Scotland, and in this country, of all denominations. In the Scotch Free Church, some of the most able and devoted of the ministry have espoused it. Dr. David Brown, of Glasgow, published, a few years since, what has been regarded in Scotland as the ablest work extant against the pre-millennial theory, to which several ministers of the Free Church replied. Several distinguished men in Europe and in this country (among them some of the prelates of the Episcopal Church), have publicly declared a complete revolution in their opinions, touching this whole subject, within a few years, renouncing the views in which they had been educated and adopting that of the pre-millennial advent and personal reign.

We are quite well assured that the subject demands earnest consideration, especially among the younger clergy and candidates for the ministry, for this if for no other reason, that the many works, popular and more elaborate, which have within the last few years issued from the press, have induced large numbers in all our churches to examine the subject, and the ministry ought to be prepared to guide them. Such a work as this of Dr. Seiss, from its popular and attractive style, and from

the warm-hearted and earnest spirit which pervades it, will carry many minds along with the argument to the conclusions he reaches. And we have no hesitation in saying, that many of the clergy who have been in the ministry a long time may gain light from some of the numerous works on this subject, unless they had more early instruction upon it than has usually been given in our Theological Seminaries, or have turned their attention specially to it subsequently; and they may meet with more difficulty in setting aside the arguments presented by some of these writers than would perhaps be supposed by them previous to a thorough examination. S.

Letters of John Calvin: Compiled from the Original Manuscripts, and edited with Historical Notes, by DR. JULES BONNET. Vol. IV. Translated from the Latin and French Languages, by MARCUS ROBERT GILCHRIST. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 821, Chestnut Street. pp. 467, large octavo.

THIS is the fourth volume of the correspondence of Calvin which the Board of Publication has given to the public. Though not so stated, we infer from the index which embraces the four volumes now issued, that this is the last of the series devoted to this correspondence. The mechanical execution of the work is in the highest style of the art, does credit to the Board, and in this respect is far superior to that of some others among the larger works it has issued. This speaks well for the Board and the times.

The present volume contains one hundred and seventy-five letters of Calvin, mostly written in the year 1559 and the five years immediately following, with a few embraced in an Appendix, ranging from 1534 to 1558; together with Calvin's Last Will and Testament, and the last two addresses which he delivered upon his death-bed, the one to the Seigneurs and the other to the Ministers of Geneva. In all, the four volumes contain nearly seven hundred letters of the great reformer.

We need scarcely recommend this series of volumes to our readers. Every thing concerning Calvin is so deeply interesting to Presbyterians, that whatever has come from his pen is sought for with avidity. No part of his writings gives so good an insight to the interior life and character of the man as his correspondence; and nothing gives a more vivid view of certain phases of the Reformation itself than these letters, covering as they do the most stirring and important period of that great social and religious revolution. They are addressed to persons in almost every rank and avocation of life, including kings and queens, noble lords and ladies, his brother reformers, churches, military leaders, and prisoners; and these persons were scattered over every country of Con-

tinental Europe and the British Isles. It is conceded by his friends and his foes, that no man was more looked up to for advice, by the learned and the great, and no one man made a more powerful impression upon that age, than John Calvin. The notes of Dr. Bonnet, appended to many of the letters in the several volumes, increase the value and add to the great historical interest of the work. S.

Bible Illustrations: Being a Storehouse of Similes, Allegories, and Anecdotes, selected from Spencer's "Things New and Old," and other sources. With an Introduction by the REV. RICHARD NEWTON, D. D., and a copious Index. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard. 1863. pp. 360.

THIS is a capital book for its purpose, which its title pretty fully indicates. The introduction and preface show that while it is designed for the general reader, it promises to be "of great service to Clergymen, to Sunday-School and Bible Class teachers, and to all whose occupation calls them to the important work of bringing God's truth to bear upon the minds of others." From a cursory examination, we think the body of the work sustains the promise here given, fully as well as some, and far better than some other works of a similar kind before the public.

Among the classes referred to as likely to receive benefit from the work, of course none can occupy a station of higher responsibility than ministers of the Gospel. It is no doubt a fault with many able preachers that their sermons are not sufficiently illustrative. Proper illustration is one of the most interesting and forcible methods of presenting truth to the minds of the masses of men, whether in colloquial or more formal discourse. While we have sometimes seen the illustrative method greatly overdone in the pulpit, in the peculiar kind as well as great number of anecdotes introduced, *ad nauseam*, on the other hand we have sometimes met with a ministerial prudery which would almost consider the pulpit incurably desecrated by the introduction of an anecdote into a sermon. Nothing is so well calculated to gain and rivet attention, the first aim of every public speaker, aside from earnestness and an evident sincerity in the truth and importance of what he is uttering as appropriate illustration. This is one of the secrets of the great power of a certain class of orators, on the stump, at the bar, and in the forum. They will sway the masses, convince juries, and frequently take captive legislative assemblies, where more learned, profound and able speakers will fail. The Scriptures are full of this method of teaching, in the Old Testament and the New. It was always our Saviour's style. Get the book and read it; and if you are a teacher, or a preacher, use it. S.

Theopneutia: The Bible, its Divine Origin and Inspiration, deduced from Internal Evidence, and the Testimonies of Nature, History and Science. By L. GAUSSEN, D. D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Oratoire, Geneva. New and revised edition, with Analysis and Topical Index. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard, 39, West Fourth Street. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1859. pp. 365.

THIS work of Dr. Gaussen has been many years before the world. It was first introduced to the more special notice of the American public through a translation made by Dr. E. N. Kirk, of Boston. The present edition, brought out by the enterprising press of Mr. Blanchard, of Cincinnati, is a reprint of a Scotch edition, translated by Mr. David D. Scott, of Glasgow. It is executed with great mechanical neatness, and appears in every respect far superior to any other edition which has come from the American press. It is "from the latest French edition," and "has the advantage of all the author's improved arrangement."

We need not say a word in favor of this work. It is too well known to require it. And we are rejoiced to see it issued from one of our Western publishing houses, at a time when the inspiration and genuineness of the sacred books are more impugned by a crafty skepticism, from men of learning, and under a guise of special solicitude for the truth, than in almost any previous age. The method of treating the subject by Dr. Gaussen, adapts it equally to the general reader and to ministers and teachers.

S.

A Critical History of Free Thought in reference to the Christian Religion: Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford, in the year 1862, on the foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M. A. Canon of Salisbury. By ADAM STOREY FARRAR, M. A., Michel Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 443 and 445 Broadway. 1863. pp. 533.

THIS is one of those works of great learning and research which will attract the attention of scholars, recently issued upon the Bampton foundation, which has hitherto afforded many valuable contributions to the Apologetics of Christianity. It deserves a more careful examination than we have yet given it. It is sufficient now to say that it is timely, meeting the present phases of modern infidelity and scepticism, philosophically and historically considered, and opposing to them the truth as the learned author views it.

S.

THE Board of Publication are issuing, in rapid succession, a series of Sabbath-School Books which are well worthy the attention of parents. We have put some of them to the test, by giving them to the young people; and some older persons hearing their children talk of them with great interest, have read them with delight. Among the recent publications are: Nina Grey, Alice Barlow, Bessie Grey, Blind Annie Lorimer, Rabella, The Sunbeam, and Rays of Light from the Sun of Righteousness.







